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## CRITICAL NOTES ON ESTHER ${ }^{1}$

By Paul Haupt
Johns Hopkins University
In the following nn . I have not attempted to give all the divergences exhibited by the Ancient Versions; as a rule, I have recorded only variations which throw some light on the Heb. text.* The ancient versions of E are so free and inaccurate ( $c f$. e. g. nn. on $\mathbf{3}, 13.14 ; \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1} .11 .14 ; \mathbf{5}, \mathbf{1 3} ; \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{1} ; \mathbf{7}, 3.4$ ) that it would be a waste of time to discuss all discrepancies.

W's $\dagger$ and J's + theory that $\mathbb{G}$ is more original than $\mathbb{f t l}^{(1)}$ seems to me untenable (cf.e. g. nn. on 6, 1; 7, 4; 8, 8). The fact that the text of $\mathfrak{G}$ does not read like a translation from the Heb. ( $c f$. however $\pi \epsilon \sigma \grave{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \sigma \hat{\eta}, 6,13) \|$ is easily explained by the popularity of E. As soon as a foreign book becomes popular, the translations become more idiomatic and free.§ If a French play is to be a success in America or England, it is impossible to present a
${ }^{1}$ Preprinted from the forthcoming William Rainey Harper Memorial Volumes.

* It might be well to add that I completed the restoration of the Heb. text of E on Oct. 16, 1905, and that I revised it twice, on Aug. 6, 1906, and July 11, 1907. The Critical Notes were begun on Jan. 24, 1906, and finished on the following day; they were rewritten from June 9 to July 13 and on Aug. 4 and 5, 1906. Finally I recast them again from June 4 to July 12, 1907.
$\dagger$ Hugo Willrich, Judaica (Gorttingen, 1900) p. 15; cf. also p. 27, 1, 20. Contrast Pur. 28, 15.
$\ddagger$ G. Jahn, Das Buch Ester (Leyden, 1901) p. vi.
$\| C f$. my remarks in Daniel 16, 23.
§ Note the adaptations of the proper names in $\mathfrak{G} \$$, discussed in nn. on $1,10.14$ and 9, 7. 1]
literal translation. It is necessary to introduce additions as well as omissions. I see nothing in $\mathfrak{G}$ that is incompatible with the view that $\mathfrak{G}$ is based on $\mathfrak{f l}$ or, to be more accurate, on a recension of the Heb. text from which $\mathfrak{f t}$ is derived (cf. e. g. nn. on 1, 10. $14 ; \mathbf{7}, 4 ; \mathbf{9}, 9$ ). W deems it not impossible that E was intended for Alexandria, and therefore written in Greek; afterwards, he thinks, it may have been translated into Heb. for the use of the Palestinian Jews. But E was written by a Persian Jew about 130 b. c. The Alexandrian festal legend for the Feast of Purim is the so-called Third Book of the Maccabees, and the Book of Judith is a Palestinian Purim legend; see Haupt, Purim (Leipzig, 1906) p. 7, ll. 30-38. I cite this book as Pur. The first number after Pur. refers to the page; the second, to the line. Cant. denotes Haupt, The Book of Canticles (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from AJSL 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32. In the same way Eccl. is used for Haupt, Ecclesiastes (Baltimore, 1905) and Nah. for Haupt, The Book of Nahum (Baltimore, 1907) reprinted from JBL 26, 1-53.

The unabbreviated names of Biblical Books printed in Italics (e. g. Kings, Psalms, \&c) denote the critical notes on the Heb. text in SBOT, i. e. my edition of The Sacred Books of the Old Testament; the first number after the name of the Book refers to the page in SBOT, the second indicates the line. Thus Genesis 50,9 refers to p. 50, 1. 9 of the critical edition of the Book of Genesis in SBOT; but Gen. 50, 9 means chapter 50, verse 9 of the Book of Genesis. In the references to SBOT the (unabbreviated) names of the Books are printed in Italics; in the references to the received text of the Heb. Bible the names of the books are abbreviated, but not italicized, and the numbers of the chapters are printed in heavy-faced figures (1, 2, 3, \&c).

I use $\mathfrak{G}$ for $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{V}}$, i.e. $\operatorname{E} \sigma \theta \eta \rho \beta$ in L's edition ( $=\mathbf{A}$ in Fritzsche's edition) and $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{L}}$ for $\mathrm{E} \sigma \theta \eta \rho a(=\mathrm{B}$ in Fritzsche's edition). $\mathbb{C}$ denotes the first Targum in L's edition; $\mathbb{C}^{2}=$ תרבום שני (the numbers after $\mathbb{T}^{2}$ refer to the pages and lines of L's edition). The apocryphal additions to E in $\mathfrak{G}$ are cited according to the cc. and vv. of the Vulgate (3) e. g. 11, $2=\mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{V}} \mathbf{1}, 1$. This corresponds to the numeration in the Authorized Version (AV).

In addition to these symbols note the following abbreviations:
$\mathrm{AG}^{2}=$ Delitzsch, Assyr. Grammatik (Berlin, 1906).-AJP = American Journal of Philology.-AJSL = American Journal of Semitic Languages.-AoF = Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen.-AOG = Winckler, Der alte Orient und die Geschichtsforschung (Berlin, 1906) $=$ MVAG 11, 1. $-\mathrm{ASKT}=$ Haupt, Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte (Leipzig, 1881).-AT = Altes Testament.-AV =Authorized Version.- $\mathrm{AV}^{\mathrm{M}}=$ Authorized Version, margin.-B=Bertheau, Die Bücher Esra, Nechemia und Ester, second edition (Leipzig, 1887) by Victor Ryssel.-BA = Beiträge zur Assyriologie von Delitzsch und Haupt.-BAL = Haupt, Beiträge zur assyrischen Lautlehre = Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, April 25, 1883.- $\mathrm{BDB}=$ Francis Brown (assisted by S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs) A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT (Boston, 1906). $-\mathrm{BL}=$ Haupt, Biblische Liebeslieder (Leipzig, 1907).-BT = L. Goldschmidt, Der babylonische Talmud.- C=Paulus Cassel, Das Buch Esther (Berlin, 1878).*-c. = chapter; cc.= chapters.-Cant. = Haupt, The Book of Canticles (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from AJSL 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32.-Ch = Cheyne.-CV (i. e. Congress-Vortrag) $=$ Haupt, Die akkadische Sprache (Berlin, 1883).-DB = Dictionary of the Bible.- E = Esther. - EB = Encyclopredia Biblica, edited by Cheyne and Black.-Eccl.=Haupt, The Book of Ecclesiastes (Baltimore, 1905) reprinted from AJP, No. 102.-T = Greek Bible (LXX) $-\mathfrak{F}^{\boldsymbol{A}}=$ Alexandrinus. $-\mathfrak{F}^{\mathrm{L}}=$ Lucianic recension edited by L (Göttingen, 1883).- $\mathfrak{G}^{5}=$ Sinaiticus.- $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathbb{V}}=$ Vaticanus.- GB $^{14}=$ Gesenius' Hebr. Handwörterbuch, edited by Buhl, fourteenth edition (Leipzig, 1905).- GK $^{27}=$ Gesenius' Hebr. Grammatik, edited by K (Leipzig, 1902) - English translation of GK ${ }^{26}$ by Collins and Cowley (Oxford, 1898).-H = Haman. $-\mathrm{HW}=$ Delitzsch, Assyr. Handwörterbuch (Leipzig, 1896).-IN = Ed. Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (Halle, 1906).-J = G. Jahn, Das Buch Ester (Leyden, 1901).- $\mathbf{3}$ (i. e. Jerome) $=$ Vulgate.-JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.-JBL=Journal of Biblical Literature.-JHUC = Johns Hopkins University Circulars (Baltimore). - K K Kautzsch (especially his Textbibel). $-1 \mathrm{~K}, 2 \mathrm{~K}=$ The first (second) Book of the Kings. $\mathbf{K A T}^{3}=$ Eb. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das AT, third edition, edited by Zimmern und Winckler (Berlin, 1903).KB = Eb. Schrader, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. $-\mathrm{L}=$ Lagarde.l. = line; ll. = lines. $-\mathrm{LB}=$ Luther's Bible. - LOT $=\mathbf{S}$. R. Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the OT. $-\mathrm{M}=$ Mordecai. $-1 \mathrm{M}, 2 \mathrm{M}=$

[^0]The first (second) Book of the Maccabees. $-\mathfrak{f f}=$ Masoretic Text.-MDOG $=$ Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft (Berlin). $-\mathrm{MSS}=$ Manuscripts. - MVAG $=$ Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft (Berlin). - $\mathrm{N}=$ Nöldeke. - n . = note; nn. = notes. - Nah. $=$ Haupt, The Book of Nahum (1907) = JBL 26, 1-53.- NT = New Testament.-O Oort, Emendationes (see Proverbs 69, 4).-OLZ = Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung, edited by Peiser.- OT = Old Testament.-p. = page; pp. = pages.-Pur. $=$ Haupt, Purim (Leipzig, 1906 ) $=$ BA 6, part 2. $-\mathrm{R}=$ Ryssel (especially his edition of B and his critical nn. in the Beilagen to K's Die Heilige Schrift des AT).- $\mathrm{S}=$ Siegfried, Esra, Nehemia und Esther (Göttingen, 1901).-1 S, 2 S = The first (second) Book of Samuel. $-\Sigma=$ Syriac Version (Peshita).— $\$^{\wedge}$ $=$ Ambrosianus. $-\mathrm{SBOT}=\mathrm{Haup} \mathrm{t}$, The Sacred Books of the OT. -SD = Haupt, Über einen Dialekt der sumerischen Sprache $=$ Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Nov. 3, 1880.-SFG = Haupt, Die sumerischen Familiengesetze (Leipzig, 1879). $\mathrm{SG}^{2}=$ Nöldeke, Syrische Grammatik, second edition (Leipzig, 1898).
 Beliefs of Ancient Israel (London, 1907).-THCO (i.e. Transactions of the Hamburg Congress of Orientalists) $=$ Verhandlungen des xiii. Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses zu Hamburg, 1902 (Leyden, 1904).$\mathrm{v} .=\mathrm{verse} ; \mathrm{vv} .=$ verses. $-\mathrm{VG}=$ Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (Berlin, 1907).-W = Willrich, Judaica (Göttingen, 1900).-Wd=Wildeboer's commentary on E in Die fünf Megillot (1898) = part xvii of K. Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT.-WdG = A Grammar of the Arabic Language, by W. Wright, third edition revised by M. J. de Goeje (Cambridge, 1896).-Wn=Winckler (especially his paper on E in AoF 3, 1-64, Leipzig, 1901, whole number xvi).- $\mathrm{ZA}=$ Zeitschrift für Assyri-ologie.-ZAT = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.ZDMG $=$ Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.ZK $=$ Zeitschrift für Keilschriflforschung.

A scholar who considers the Moabite stone to be metrical may discuss the poetic form of E ;* but so far as I can see, it is written in prose, just as Ruth and Jonah are (apart from the Maccabean psalm inserted in c. 2; see AJSL 23, 256).

For $\operatorname{クIDN}=$ Ištar, a feminine form of Ašur, Benignus, so that $\mathrm{E}=$ Benigna (cf. Lat. Bona Dea) see my paper The Name

[^1]Istar in JAOS 28, 112-119; and for the Herodotean prototype of E and Sheherazade (Фaıঠvムín, Нer. 3, 68) see Pur. 8, 21 (cf. 40, 20). $\mathbb{C}^{2}(241,16)$ says of E : א־תקרי שמוה אסתר בשם כוכב בוהדה "ונית איסתירו.

## $N$

(1) ft

 afterwards transposed, while the , was corrupted to 9 . The name ד. דin

For the transposition of the vowels cf. $\mathbf{a}$. 3,12 ) for (see n. on
 see Pur. 23, 15;* cf. L, Purim, p. 52, below.

The first $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ of of a corruption of $\boldsymbol{\square}$, the second $\varphi$ is due to dittography of the 7 ; cf. the dittographed $\boldsymbol{\square}$ ו in and Ruth 2, 8; 3, 14; also לעבוחי, Nah. 2, 1 (see Nah. 29, below) and (9, 19). The letters 1 and ${ }^{\text {, }}$ as well as 9 and 9 are often confounded, dittographed and haplographed (Pur. 51, 22). For $\dagger$ and $\cdot$ cf. E 8, 13; Ruth 2, 1, and Kings 259, 29. \& reads correctly , חשיארש : , just as we find in an Aramaic inscription sponding to the Babyl. Xiši'aršu $(-i,-a)$ or Axšiíaršu $(x=خ)$.
 instead of (Ex. 15, 2) in AJSL' 20,158 , below (see also 23, 225, below). The suffix in due to dittography of the initial $\rightarrow$ of the following $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, 2 . In the gloss $2 \mathrm{~K} 16,10$ we find דרבשק $\boldsymbol{T}$; in Job 41, 21 (a variant to v. 20) תוחת = Assyr. tartaxu, shaft, arrow (KB 6, 328). In E 1, 16; 2, 21; 3, 12; 8, 10 we find ; in 10, 1:
 although the first $\rceil$ is a corruption of $\boldsymbol{\square}$. In the omission of the 9 (for ${ }^{\circ}$ ) before 7 is due to haplography; similarly 9 has been


[^2]


In 27 out of the 29 cases in which the name occurs in E it is due to scribal expansion; cf. especially $1,15.16$; it is original only in the opening clause ' $\mathbf{x}$ • ויחּ
 ( $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 131, \mathrm{~g}$ ) either the name or the title is due to scribal expansion. The proper Eng. phrase is King David, the proper Heb. expression is Tלnn 7nt. The king David is neither good Eng. nor good Heb. The proper names (David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Jehoram, Jehoash, Rezin, Josiah) must be omitted e. g. in $1 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{1}, \mathrm{32}. \mathrm{37;} \mathrm{5}, \mathrm{27;} \mathrm{8}, \mathrm{5;} \mathrm{9}, \mathrm{11;} \mathrm{12} 6.$, $18 ; 2$ K 3,$6 ; 14,11 ; 16,6.11 .17 ; 22,24 ; 23,29, *$ while the omission of the title king is required e.g. in $1 \mathrm{~K} 1,53 ; 2,29 ; 10,16.21 .23 ; 2 \mathrm{~K} 16$, 11. 16; 25, 8. Even in cases where 7 . 2 is affixed to the proper name, the title may often be omitted; cf.e.g. $2 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{9,15}$ and Stade's nn. (in Kings) on the passages cited above.

It is often stated that the name of God is never mentioned in E (cf. n. on 4,14 ) while the King of Persia is referred to 187 times, and his kingdom $26+$ times; cf. e.g. W 27 and Hastings' DB 1, 733, footnote. S (137, n. 1) remarks that the King is mentioned 190 times. I find that the name אחשׁירש occurs 29 times, while he is simply referred to as the King 193 times. This would be 222 times, not 187. In several passages, however, the title 7 -2T does not refer to Xerxes in particular, but means royal in general.
 This discrepancy is not striking if the name is a later addition
 later correction, just as $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{L}}$ Ovaatıv for $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{v}}$ A $\sigma \tau \iota v$. \& reads, at the beginning of the parenthesis, Acene orm. According to AoF 3, 5 אחדּ is Cambyses, and the conspiracy in 2, 21 was aimed at Cyrus ( $c f$. below, ad 2,21) but King $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ (in E represents Alexander Balas (see Pur. 29, 8; 35, 42) i. e. the poor and wise youth alluded to in Eccl. 4, 13 (for poor = humble, of mean birth, of low origin, see AJSL 23, 226, n. 13).

The parentheses are a characteristic feature of E (cf. Pur. 9, 6). We find a great many explanatory parentheses in Herodotus; cf. e. g. Holder's edition where the parentheses are enclosed in () while glosses are enclosed in []. As E was written about в.c. 130, the Sadducean author may have read Herodotus' work, just as the Sadducean author of Ecclesiastes may have been acquainted with the works of Epicurus

[^3]and other Greek philosophers (Eccl. 6, n. 7). I have indicated the parentheses by () e.g. זr. 13. 14; 2, 5. 12; 5, 7. Transpositions are indicated by \{\} and [] e.g. v. 6, not by ().

For

 tion of Darius at Naqs-i-Rustam the name appears as Indu. The
腊, not influenced by
 instead of $i$ or $e$ may be explained in the same way as in $\mathbf{N}:=$ Assyr. Ni', Thebes; see Nah. 30 and cf. my Assyr. E-vowel, p. 22. It is possible that the Heb. o was pronounced $\bar{o}$, just as the Assyr. $u$ seems to have been sounded as $\bar{u}$; see Ezekiel 64, 43.

 uhen the King sat on his royal throne, but when he acceded to the throne. The beginning of the following rerse. howerer. shows that the great banquet was given, not at the accession of the King, but in the third rear of his reign. $W$ (16. abore; cf. 21. below) referred $\mathfrak{G} \dot{\epsilon} \theta_{\rho o v i}{ }^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \eta$ (sereral MSS have $\dot{\epsilon} v \epsilon \theta_{\rho o v i \sigma \theta \eta \text { ) }}$ to the solemn enthronization of the King, which may hare been celebrated three years after the accession of the King (cf. Jacob, ZAT 10, 281). The German Emperor William I. succeeded his elder brother Frederick William IT. on Jan. 2, 1861, but his coronation was celebrated at Königsberg on Oct. 18, 1861. © 'époovíot
 enthronization ( $c f$. ėv aủraîs taîs $\dot{\eta} \mu$ épaus) but this is not the original meaning of $\mathfrak{f t}$. Cf. also E 5.1 and Herod. 7. 102; Plut. Themist. c. 13.
 citadel (HW 185 a) 。f so, correctly S. Cf. my remarks on the Acropolis of Ninereh (Nah. 41). The royal palace was situated in the Acropolis (C 13. belorr) not in the city. The city was separated from the Acropolis by the Choaspes; see


(3) Before ל-T we must insert רוֹר; so $\mathbf{R}$ (in K) and S.
 17, 490.
(4) The statement ( $\operatorname{HoF} 3,31, \mathrm{n} .1$ ) that the original meaning of this passage was undoubtedly that the King gave a banquet after haring displayed his porver is untenable; ทลกาส cannot mean after having

 gratuitous．

The 180 days may be an exaggeration，just as the 10,000 talents $(3,9)$ or the 50 cubits $(5,14)$ or the 75,000 said to have been slain by the Jews $(9,16)$ but the author undoubtedly intended to consey the idea that the banquet lasted 180 days，i．e．half a year．
ff ロッグ ロッグ is a corrective gloss（or variant；cf．A $\delta a \rho$ Nıoav in $\mathfrak{G b}^{\text {l }} 3,7$ and Kings 213，48；291，4；Nah．40，5；also n．on Nラシニベ，v．10，
 $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {vL }}$ ．The glossator may have considered the 180 days an exaggeration； $c f$ ．second n ．on 6,8 ．
 analogy of the verbs $\pi^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ，the $\boldsymbol{N}$ is silent；cf．（Is．9，4）i．e． $\mathfrak{T O}=\boldsymbol{\sim}$ 280， 48.

 iup $\boldsymbol{T}$ リ it to mean old and young．

Instead of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ Kings 173，8．The in this case indicates an accented short $e$ ；see below，n．on v．22；contrast THCO 209.

In －
 ßaciléws．The feast was not given in the park：this would have ruined the park；it was given in the forecourt of the royal park．This fore－ court（ $D$ in the groundplan of the Acropolis of Susa in Billerbeck＇s Susa，p．132）had a mosaic pavement．A mosaic pavement in the park （ $B$ ）would be very strange．Nor is E＇s banquet（c．7）given in the $n \dot{j}$ ベニ ；the King goes from E＇s banquet to the park（7，7）and returns from the park to the place of the banquet $(\mathbf{7}, 8)$ ．According to Ch （EB
 nut－trees that was meant！It might just as well be explained as a slight
 derived from bîtânu，palace．Cf．tarbaçu ša bîtâni in Behrens， Briefe kultischen Inhalts（Leipzig，1906）p．39，n．3．The idea（AoF
 appadan or maethana）＊is impossible；see Pur． 48,10 ．The punctu－
＊Cf．N，Aufsatze zur persischen Geschichte（Leipzig，1887）p． 152 and my ASKT 165， below．
ation $\operatorname{TNM}^{n}$ is just as wrong as the vocalization of（v．6）and

（6）fit
 must exchange places（ $c f . n$ ．on 3,11 ）with of $\boldsymbol{\uparrow ⿰ ⿺ 乚 一 匕 ⿱ ㇒ 日 ⿱ 一 土 儿 , ~}$ cf．the remarks on $\operatorname{mpp}$ ロィב（Nah．3，17）in Nah．33．For 7 \％ תฟֹת cf．my remarks in THCO 220．Both terms are Babyl．loanwords （KAT ${ }^{3}, 649$, n．2）．The prefixed gloss $7 \boldsymbol{\pi}$ explains the color of the อฐาコ，while the affixed gloss $\mathfrak{F}$ ユ describes the fine quality of the





Before 0 ge we must insert the preposition กñ；this was prob ably displaced by the gloss $7 \pi$ ；cf．n．on אn（instead of in v． 10 and n．on 3，11；also Nah． 25 （ad 1，11）．There is a certain graphic similarity between 9 and $\pi$ ；not only 9 and 9 are confounded （see above，$\alpha d$ v．1）but also $\dagger$ and $\pi$ ：in $\boldsymbol{\eta}$（Ezr．4，13．20；7，24） e．g．the feminine $\Omega$ of the Babyl．term biltu（from bユา）has been cor－ rupted to $\uparrow$ ；the original form may have been בִּ běnát（JAOS 13，lii，below；JBL 19，77，below）．On the other hand
 Sachau，Drei aram．Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine（Berlin，1907）
 Contrast L，Pur．52，below；also Bıテ日ávŋs（Arrian 3，19，4）．

It is impossible to regard vv．6．7，with B and Wb ，as exclamations； nor can we，with AV，supply at the beginning of v .6 ：where were（in K＇s AT dort gab es；S da war）．
ffl
 Ger．eingefasst；so B and K；contrast Keil，Schultz，Wb，S（befestigt）．
 poles；see my translation of Cant． 5,14 in AJSL 18，199；cf．THCO 234 and BL 10.

Before $510 \%$ we must insert the preposition ュ．It is not necessary

 marble：نֵּ（＝ byssus，i．e．white lawn；see the third paragraph of the nn．on the
present verse）$=$ Assyr．šaššu（i．e．šâšu；cf．laššu＝lašu＝
 dine marble，i．e．probably verd－antique．－ff 7 － $\mathfrak{G}$ mivvivos（cf．Arab． $\jmath^{\nu}$ durr，pearls）may be lumachelle or shell－marble（Ger．Muschel－ marmor）which the ancient Persians may have obtained from the neigh－ borhood of Astrakhan；the Astrakhan lumachelle is dark brown with orange shells．Muschelkalk（shell－limestone）is called in Assyrian pilu or palu $=\pi \hat{\omega} \rho o s ;$ see AJSL 23，259，below；Nah．16，n．15．－Heb． กーデに may be identical with Assyr．sixru（HW $495^{\text {b }}$ ）which is probably another name for šubû（HW 637 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ）＝ジロ（Ex．28，19；39，12）rendered in $\mathfrak{G 3}$ ： ảxárŋs；so it may mean onyx marble which the Romans called alabastrites．Onyx is but a variety of agate．Delitzsch＇s conjecture （Proleg．85）that šubtu $=\underset{\text { und }}{ }$ denotes the diamond，is improbable．－ The meaning of $\underset{\sim}{*}$ is reasonably certain；the explanation of the three other terms is more or less conjectural．
（7）ift（ctan 7 （cf．2， 18 and $1 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{10,13)} \mathrm{is} \mathrm{correctly} \mathrm{paraphrased}$ in 3：ut magnificentia regia dignum erat；cf．Kings 186， 45.
（8）For

 but no one restricted；so，correctly，Schultz．Cf．the Ithpeel $\boldsymbol{E}$ ： in the Talmudic passages Ned． $27^{a}$ ；Keth． $16^{b}$ ，cited in Jastrow＇s dictionary；also in Dalman＇s Wörterbuch こכNスN is explained to mean gehindert werden．The stem ごN means to constrain；this may mean either to urge to action or to restrain from action．The stem ここณ may be conuected with Assyr．urâsu，overseer（HW 136 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ）．For the change

 respond to Assyr．magâru；this rerb（HW 392）means originally to fall down，to submit（Ger．sich untemwerfen）$=\mathbf{9} 92 \psi 89,45$ ．
 gloss 9， 31 ．

The distributive repetition $\boldsymbol{\sim}$＂א゙ mon in E ，just as the parentheses referred to above，in nn．on v .1 ；the infinitive absolute instead of the finite verb，discussed below，in $n$ ．on －min $(2,18)$ and the use of Aramaic words，mentioned below，ad 4，4； $7, \mathbf{4}^{\top} ; 9,21.23 ; c f$ ．also the Aramaic forms and constructions discussed






According to the Talmud（Meg．12³；BT 3，579）every guest received the wine of his native district（cf． $\mathbb{T}^{2} 224,23$ ；contrast 237,5 ）just as at certain modern entertainments the guests are sometimes asked to order
 ות
（9）fft Mašti；see Pur．10，29．For $\boldsymbol{\eta}=$ Assyr．$m$ see n．on $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{0}(8,9)$ ．$C f$ ．
 daughter of Evil－Merodach，grand－daughter of King Nebuchadnezzar
 Assur being often used as a synonym for Jerahmeel．＇Cf．Ch＇s expla－


 9，4；1n゙ニニ，1，22；see Kings 301， 45.
ft Tnueg is pluperfect，as in 2，1；see Kings 247，16；cf．below，

 tertiary addition；cf．above，$a d \mathrm{v} .1$ ．
（10）The names of the seren chamberlains of the king are just as doubtful as the names of the seren councilors（r．14）and the names of the ten sons of $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{9}, \mathbf{7})$ ．The name א゙ックロー is mentioned again in 7， 9 as ージニーか，with final $\boldsymbol{T}$ instead of $\mathbf{N}$（ $c f$ ．Ruth 1,20 \＆c）．The name N
 （г．14）．The name of the fellow－conspirator of ベミジ in 2，21；6，2： ジำ was displaced（cf．ZDMG 61，286，1．18；Ňah．25，1．26；BL 62，n．50） in the present passage by ヘロコニベィ，which is merely a gloss（or variant； cf．last n．on $\Gamma .4$ ）to Nワİ with prefixed 9 explicative（cf．Pur．15．31） just as ぶごこ seems to be a rariant of the preceding ごッ（r．14）．But the name ザワด is preserved in 5 5．
$\mathfrak{G}^{\top}$ gives the following seren names：A $\mu a v, \mathrm{M} \alpha{ }^{2} \alpha \nu, ~ © a \rho \rho a, ~ B \omega \rho a \zeta \eta$ ，




 addition prefixed to the $\operatorname{Book}(\tau .11=312,1)$ we find $\Gamma a \beta a \theta a$ каi ©appa． $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ Baya日av кai ©apas in 2， 21 is a subsequent addition．$\quad$ Гaßa $\theta \alpha$ is a trans－



©apoa the names Aftaos（var．Aбтаүos）каì ఆєбєvтоs，Josephus（Ant．11， 6，4）Bayatwos каi $\Theta \epsilon о \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta s(=\boldsymbol{\sim} \boldsymbol{\sim}$ ，with 7 for 7 ）．The Vetus Latina has in 2，21：Bartageus et Thedestes．According to W 19 the original
 of ©єódoros，this name would be a Greek adaptation like фpovpac for






ff バッニーグ does not appear in $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ ，but $\mathfrak{G}^{1}$ has instead of $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ ©appa （for $\Theta a \rho \sigma a$ ）$=$ ת In 7， $9 \mathfrak{G}^{v}$ has for $\mathfrak{f x}$ กミาニาก the name Bovyäav which seems to corre－


 Kings 176,33 ）may have been influenced by the Greek names＇A ${ }^{2}$ âas， ＂A ${ }^{\prime}$ a日os，\＆c．According to Jewish tradition Harbonah was a good man； he is blessed with M and E after the reading of the Megillah at the Feast of Purim．The transposition in $\mathcal{\&}$ Nลาニーา may represent a simi－ lar adaptation；ベコニルา suggested the verbs

 23,235, n． 46 ；also n．on 9,9 ．The name Nョュユา－suggested destruc－
 on $\mu$ ovzaios and $\beta$ ovyáios in the nn，on v． 14.
 $\boldsymbol{\eta}=\boldsymbol{a}$ cf．the remarks on $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ the name מרש תhich corresponds to the third name in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ，©appa．The


 to the eunuchs，the names in $\$$ are practically identical with those in $f$ ft． The differences consist in transpositions and other slight graphic varia－


 A $\mu$ av（3，1）．

3 Mauman，Bazatha，Harbona，Bagatha，Abgatha，Zethar，Char－ chas follows $\mathfrak{f f}$ ；so，too， $\mathbb{C}$ ．

The derivation of סno from Assyr. ša reši (ZDMG 53, 116) seems
 270, 26.
 me, $I$ do not mind, Eth. oolu: mannána, to reject; Arab. mumâ'ana, deliberation) may be a secondary Piel derived from the interrogative pronoun $\eta^{2}$, what? (cf. Assyr. mînŭ, how? and minû, what? ) i.e. a compound of the interrogative pronoun $\geq$, who? what? and the interrogative particle 5: nu (cf. n. on 7, 5). Heb. meant originally she said, What! Cf. AJSL 22, 259 and WdG 1,

fft is scribal expansion; cf. the remarks on וֹשת in


 (3,4) also (9,31) and (9,32).
 3 leges ac jura majorum, AV law and judgment, LB Recht und Händel) the term is not added as an explanation of $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{T}(\mathrm{S})$. The meanings of the two terms are entirely different: $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ד denotes especially a personal or executive act, while ${ }^{\top}$ - denotes a legislative act; $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a royal
 paragraph of nn . on 1,14) or edict, and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{T}}$ means consuetudinary law including the ecclesiastical (ceremonial, ritual) law; in Arabic the term din is therefore used for religion. The term corresponds to the decisions of the Roman emperors, which were called decrees (Lat. decreta) and formed part of the imperial constitutions (Lat. constitu-
 Heb. $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{T}$ is a Pers. loanword (cf. Ezra 63, 18) and means lit. what is given (Lat, datum). Heb. ${ }^{-1}$, on the other hand, is a Babyl. loanword ( $\mathrm{KAT}^{3}$, 650 below) which may ultimately be, not Semitic, but Sumerian (SD 527, 1). Babyl. dinu corresponds to Sumer. di=din, just as qana, reed is derived from Sum. gi=gin (CV 9). For the vanishing of final consonants in Sumerian see SFG 49; ASKT 136, 1. 7; CV 8; and for the preservation of silent final consonants in loanwords cf. Pur. 16, 32 (also
 near, i.e. he summoned (cf. Josh. 7, 16; 1 S 10, 20; Jer. 30, 21) or he had summoned (cf. the n. on עשׁחה, v. 9). S's conjecture החקחק $(1 \mathrm{~K} 5,7)$ is not good. $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ кà̀ $\pi \rho o \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \in v$ a $\hat{\tau} \underset{\omega}{\omega}\left(\mathfrak{G}^{L} \pi \rho o \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o v\right)$ does not presuppose a different consonantal text; the Hiphil may be
intransitive；cf．Ex．14， 10 and Kings 174，27；nor need we read the
 os ャッチャ．

The names of the seven councilors are just as doubtful as the names of the seven chamberlains in $\nabla .10$ ； first part of the name of 12 ；see Ezra 34，5．－For $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ ．
 Axseri given in the cuneiform account of the fourth campaign of Sar－ danapalus（KB 2，177，1．126）as the name of the King of Man（or Van； cf．n．on＂ย，จ．9）between Lake Van and Lake Urumiah；cf． Ninth Annual Report of the Johns Hopkins University（Baltimore，1884） p．28．According to TBAI 166 are corruptions of
 こา² may be a shorter form of the following name N：ごッ（cf．n．on

 16 and 21.

For the seven names of fit（3 Charsena，Sethar，Admatha，Tharsis， Mares，Marsana，Mamuchan） $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathbb{V}}$ has but three，viz．＇Аркєa人îos，इapoa－
 F12\％；this may be a Greek adaptation，just as фpovpai，vigils for
 ＂む心（see n．on 3，1）．For the article $c f$ ．the remarks on $\dot{\text { o }}$ Mapסoxaios＝ י regarded as a dialectic by－form of $\mu$ o七хıкós，adulterous；cf．Eolian Moîra $=$ Mov̂ra，Moıraîos $=$ Movgaîos．This councilor may have been called of $\mu$ ovxaios，because he advises the King to divorce the Queen；cf．



 Nクシニ＝N゙ロシュ．The form of the name in $\mathfrak{G}$ may have been influenced


 remarks on $\Lambda a ́ \rho \iota \sigma \sigma a=$ Rêš－íni（Heb．－7）in ZDMG 61， 284 and Nah． 45，below．－Consequently the three names in $\mathfrak{G}$ correspond to



בצרס as appositive to תרששישׁ
 various spellings of the same name cf．Kings 275,29 ．In $\mathfrak{G}^{4}$ four of the names of the ten sons of H have dropped out．It is possible，however， that the additional names of $\mathfrak{f f}$ in the present passage are due to scribal expansion．Cf．also $\mathbb{E}^{2}(238,24)$ ．
 Here the names תרשׁישׁ
 positions and other slight graphic variations，the names in $\mathcal{s}$ are again （cf．v．10）practically identical with those in ffte．The corruption
 าถย์ See also Marquard，Fundamente，pp．68－73，cited EB 1402，n． 2.
（15）The ספּ
 clause（contrast n．on 2，6）．We must read：חּחּ ת decree（patent）．Cf．n．on （3，2）．The prefixed before the question very strange．There is no כדת before
 is merely a free rendering of חコּクロニ ก Meyer，Geschichte des Alterthums，3， 34.

 correction for $\mu$ ovхaîos．
（17）ffl means procedure，behavior，attitude；cf．v．13．The following הכלקan is not genitivus objectivus（ $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 128, \mathrm{~h}$ ；cf． n ．on 4 ，
 $c f$ ．the rendering of $(3,13)$ in $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {L }}$ ．For the explicative каí see
 N

For ff לy read לאל（
 Nah．20，ad v． 9.

The suffix in men and women will say：The King commanded Queen Vashti to

[^4]appear before him，and she did not come．But even if ニーロベニ referred exclusively to the women，it would not be necessary to substitute ワクロハニ；see Kings 83， 35.






 5－゙ア means：Whenever there is contempt（disrespect，disobedience．on the part of the women）there is wrath（on the part of the princes）．Heb． －דּ，wenever（Job 39，25）means lit．in the sufficiency，abundance， frequency；for ${ }^{-7}$ cf．Proverbs 61，6．The Versions did not understand
 ineso $120 ; \mathrm{mos}$ ， 3 unde regis justa est indignatio．B＇s sie werden reden，und zwar nach Genüge Verachtung und Zorn is impossible． AV，Thus（shall there arise）too much contempt and wrath．Similarly Wd（following R in K ）und nach Genüge Verachtung und Verdruss （wird es geben）and S und es wird dem entsprechend Geringschatzung
 be on the part of the ladies，and the $-\Sigma \rho$ on the part of their husbands．
 Tンn see Kings 137， 17.

 instead of ワתニא in 4， 4 ．
fft maiy b 1 S 28， 17 （ 7 －ib is gloss）and Neh．2， 1 （see Kings 74，7）．
ff ーロッロ ーズer does not mean who is more beautiful than she

 ov̉テŋ aủrŋ̂s， 3 altera quae melior est illa，AV unto another that is better than she．The new queen is to be just as beautiful as Vashti，but of a sweeter disposition，not so ill－tempered．The idea of the author was no doubt that Vashti＇s refusal to obey the King＇s command was simply due to her bad humor（so，correctly，S，ad r．12）although N（EB 1403） says，It has been well remarked by A．H．Niemeyer that the most re－ spectable character in the Book is Vashti who declines to exhibit her charms before the crowd of revelers．According to $\mathbb{T}^{2}(224,27 ; 237,30)$ the King commanded the Queen to appear naked（Nロ゙ヴゴシ）before his guests．
 concessive: although it is great, however great it be; cf. Proverbs 39, 35; OLZ 10, 65, n. 3; Nah. 39 (ad Jer. 50, 11). S renders correctly: so gross es ist; but the explanation given in his nn. is not satisfactory (cf. n. on 4, 7).

According to B the phrase means here, not noble and mean (so, correctly, Schultz and S; cf. as in $\nabla .5$, but old and young. $\mathfrak{G}^{\vee} \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \pi \tau \omega \chi o \hat{v} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~S} \pi \lambda o v \sigma i o v, \mathfrak{G}^{L} \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \pi \tau \omega \chi^{\omega} \nu$ єँ $\omega \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \lambda$ dovaí $\omega v$.
(22) Heb. (i.e. sĕ́fr; see Nah. 29, below) is an Assyr. loanword and means originally message $=$ Assyr. šipru; see Kings $198,47$. Assyr. šapâru, to send is a Šaphel of 7 ; see Nah. 24, below; cf. n. on שטק (3, 9).

 cussed, but there is no reference to is: he is to talk plainly to her, as we say to talk plain English or United States, Ger. mit dem werde ich einmal Deutsch reden, French je vais lui parler français or je rous le dis en bon français; cf. my remarks on بر|, JBL 19, 66. The modern Yiddish phrase is mámme lóshen reden, to talk in the mother tongue ( m amme= mamma, mother, and
 his wife, not in Hebrew, but in the language of his people, i. e. in plain Greek, just as a Jewish rabbi in Berlin would talk to his wife in such a case, not in Hebrew, but in German; cf. the last n. on 8, 9. But $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi \mu \tau \rho i \omega \varphi$ ф $\omega \nu \hat{\eta}$ (2 Macc. 7, 8. 21. 27) does not mean in der Landessprache (so Kamphausen in K) but in the paternal (or ancestral) language, i. e. in Hebrew (or Aramaic). The language of the country would be

$\mathfrak{3}$ et hoc per cunctos populos divulgari (AV that it should be published according to the language of every people) is a guess. ftt リタy
 posed by Hitzig and accepted by Rawlinson, Reuss, Orelli, O, $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K}$; but not by Wd and S) is impossible (cf. n. on 5, 11). In the first place, we should expect ì לֹ read for him, implying a restriction; $\hat{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ To talk as he pleases would be
 S ows ए

（1）fit Mil forget her；he thought of her with affection and was inclined to reinstate
 tous as in Eccl．11，9 or in $\ddagger 12 \ddot{5}$ ？ ？

（3）甜 $\mathbb{M}$ ²

 Nah．32．For nא cf．Proverbs 51，17．According to B．Luther（in IN 79．119）（Ex．2，1）means，not a daughter of Levi，a Levitess，but the daughter of Levi，so that Moses would be a grandson of Jacob．

For אn（in the scribal expansion derived from v．8）＊read an in v．8．${ }^{3}$ Egeus， $\mathfrak{Z} \boldsymbol{\sim}$ ； $\mathfrak{G}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ Tau，as though the initial $\pi$ were the article，while $\mathfrak{G}^{L}$ substitutes in the present gloss：$\Gamma \omega \gamma a i o s$, and in the original passage（v．8）：ßovyáios．For these two names in ${ }^{\text {ch }}$ see below，

（5）For the introductory clause $c f$ ．the beginning of the Book of Job．
 there had been（for a long time）a Jewish man in the Acropolis of Susa．

The name
 cf．${ }^{\boldsymbol{j}}$ ）$C f$ ．the remarks on the transposition of vowels in nn ．on
 the usual punctuation（6）（ 5 ）but the original pronunciation
 Ezra 58，41． $\mathbb{C}$ combines the name with N゙ざ N゙ーグ2，pure myrrh． $\mathfrak{G}$ ，

 the article，and ${ }^{\circ} \Gamma_{\iota \epsilon \xi_{\iota}}=$（see Kings 192，23）．The Herodotean pro－ totype of M is Otanes；the Maccabean prototype is Jonathan（see Pur．8，22；6，36）but the name $\mathbf{M}$ is Babylonian．The author of $\mathbf{E}$ would not have given his Jewish hero and heroine（for $\mathbf{E}=\mathrm{I}$ štar see above，p．101）names connected with heathen deities，unless M（ó Mapoo－ $\chi^{\text {aios }}$ ）and E had been the familiar names of some favorite characters in the popular festal legends and dramatic plays（Pur．38，31）for the

[^5](Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (Pur. 11, 31). According to Ch (EB 3198) M derived his name, not from Marduk (so, too, C 50, below) but from Jerahmeel: Abihail is most probably a popular corruption of Jerahmeel, Kish $=$ Cushi, and the true name of $\mathbf{M}$ may have been Carmeli; cf. the Jerahmeelitish explanations of the names Vashti (1,9) and Shethar, Tarshish $(1,14)$ and contrast IN 400,1 .
(6) $\mathfrak{f t}$ (

 Shimei (about 1000 в. с.) and Saul's father, Kish (about 1050) are two of his famous ancestors; cf. the complete genealogies of $\mathbf{M}$ in $\mathbb{C} 7,6 ; \mathbb{T}^{2}$ 2,5. C 52 deems it impossible that K ish in the present passage represents the father of Saul. © inserts between Shimei and Kish the name of Shimei's father, Gera. Shimei is named, because he considered himself at least as good as David; just as M, the descendant of the first king of Israel, considered himself at least as good as the barbarian H (see $\mathrm{ad} 3,4$ ). M is introduced as a descendant of Saul, not as a son of David, because under the reign of the Maccabean princes descendants of
 Heb. form of the Jewish name Meier, Meyer, \&c, see BA 1,170, below.
 Babyl. Nabû-kudurrí-uçur. For the correct pronunciation of mispointed cuneiform names see Kings 270, 16. The best form is the

 due to dittography of the 7 ; $c f$. the remarks on $(1,1)$ for שine The $\boldsymbol{N}$ (which was assimilated to the preceding consonant; $c f$. Nun = xitt, =xiţ, SFG 11, below; VG 127, $\delta$ ) is found also in



 to substitute in the text of an English author sycomore for sycamore, or Nazirite for Nazarite. The omission of the $\boldsymbol{N}$ and the substitution of $y$ for $\boldsymbol{\square}$ no doubt represent the actual pronunciation. The $\boldsymbol{g}$ is certainly not due to graphic corruption, while the alleged preservation of the $o$ in the final syllable $7 \boldsymbol{\square}$ (Ezra 26,51 ) may be due to dittography of the $\boldsymbol{7}$.
 Babyl. xadaššatu, bride; for $\pi=\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\dot{C}}$ and $\mathcal{O}=$ cuneiform wee

*According to TBAI 166. n. 3, 707 is doubtless derived from $7 \boldsymbol{T H}[\mathbf{N}] . C f$, Ch's explanation of ตราบท $(1,9)$.
stems of Assyr. xadaššatu (with $\dot{\boldsymbol{C}}$ ) and Syr. 120.0 (N円TM, SG $^{2}$, $\S 26$, B, with $ح^{\text {) are not identical; but Aram. NEN, myrtle may be a }}$ contraction of xadaššatu (see Pur. 39, 23) and תoTm may be connected also with A $\delta a \sigma a$ ( $=\boldsymbol{=} \boldsymbol{T} \boldsymbol{T}$, Nova) i.e. the name of the place where Nicanor, the prototype of H (Nah. 26, 1; 30, 4) was defeated on the $13^{\text {th }}$ of Adar, 161 в.c. (Pur. 9, 26). Alasa, the name of the place where Judas Maccabæus was slain, may be an intentional alteration of Adasa; see Pur. 38, 39.
ff תn the daughter of his uncle (the brother of his father) means, of course, his cousin (cf. the extract from Maqrizi in L, Purim, p. 13) not his niece. Wd ( 169 , below) calls $\mathrm{E} M$ 's cousin, but in the introduction to c. 2 he refers to her as M's niece; so, too, p. 181, 1. 10; on p. 186 (bis) he calls M $E$ 's uncle. The same mistake is made by N (EB 1400-7) and S (149, 1. 8 from the bottom). Cf. also W 17. 18; C 49, 10; 57, 17; 78, 15. In C 53, 8 E's father, Abihail, is said to be a cousin of M. B (400) has correctly cousin, not niece. $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ inserts between $\theta v$ dád $^{-}$

fft
 turn in the sense of form, shape; cf. n. on "קּ9゙1 (Cant. 7, 2) AJSL 18, 217. The $a$ in is on a par with the Pathah furtive. Cf. also Kings 167, 37.



 The word $\Omega^{\circ}$, house is used in the Talmud for wife. The original form of $\Omega^{\top}$, house was ba't, see AJSL 22, 258, below; for bat = bint, daughter see Pur. 50, 25. 3, correctly, Mardochous sibi eam adoptavit in filiam; \& $1 \sum_{i}$ ص

 French s'empresser (S, betrieb eifrig). The cosmetic treatment could not be hastened; a period of twelve months was prescribed by a royal decree (v. 12) and E had to await her turn (v. 15). Nor did Hegai hasten to send E her meals; she was not starring. But he took a special interest in E and gave special orders concerning her cosmetic treatment and her meals; cosmetic treatment without proper diet does not help very much. Hegai also devoted special attention to the selection of E's seven maids. His experienced eye saw that $\mathbf{E}$ was likely to become queen (contrast C 58, 12).
 is more Aram．than Heb．）see K＇s Aram．Gr．§§ 75．84；GK ${ }^{32^{-}}$，$\S 142$ ，f，






 tion raised by several commentators，that the Persian officers could not fail to discover E＇s Jewish extraction，is not valid．The officials in charge of a royal harem pay rery little attention to the race and faith of
 not asked any questions；but，at the adrice of M，she did not talk of her Jewish extraction，because this might hare spoiled her chances of becom－ ing Queen． 3 quae noluit indicare ei populum et patriam suam is mis－ leading．See also nn．on $3,4$.
（11）fft min means opposite（or in front of）the forecourt，$\approx$
 forecourt of the harem；cf．4，2．6．Wd raises the question how it was possible that a man could talk to a girl from the royal harem，and how her Jewish extraction could be kept secret under those circumstances． Similarly N（EB 1401）sars that M was able to communicate freely with his niece（contrast $n$ ．on $\boldsymbol{1} \boldsymbol{7} \boldsymbol{n}=, ~ v .7)$ in the harem．S states：uber die Schwierigkeit，wie M（S，throughout，Mordehai，as though it were －ーTーツ ！cf．n．on 4，7）ohne Eunuch $\dagger$ zu sein im Frauentorhofe sich blicken lassen durfte und $E$ dort sprechen konnte，geht der spät－jüd． Erzähler leicht hinweg．The narrator，it may be supposed，knew more about Oriental manners and customs than did $S$ ；the author did not
 in c． 4 E sends Hatach to M，and M sends his answers through this eunuch．If M walked in the place before the forecourt of the royal harem，he could easily get some nerrs concerning the inmates of the harem from the eunuchs．By some diplomatic questions he could even obtain some special information concerning E without revealing the fact that she was his cousin and foster－daughter．He could simply ask，How is that beautiful girl in whom Hegai takes so great an interest？See also n ．on 6， 10.
＊Cf．e．g．F．Marion Craw ford＇s love story of Old Constantinople：Arethusa，a Prin－ cess in Slavery，and n． 42 to my lecture on Ecclesiastes in the Oriental Studies（Boston，1894）． See also C 63， 3.
$\dagger$ M may have been a eunuch just as Nehemiah；see Ezra 67， 10 and Pur．52，15，also BL 118，1．9．Cf．the conclusion of n ．on 4,8 ．
(12) For the striking similarity of the first clause of this rerse (of. also v. 15) and the statement in Herod. 3, 79 see Pur. 9, 2. C'f. also n. on 4,13 .

The $\because=\sim$ had an antiseptic effect, and purified the skin; the
 sage, \&c) made the skin white and soft, and improved the figure.

 Wd thinks that it may have this meaning; $(\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1 6})$ on the other hand, means and in this condition, not and then. We find $i=\sim$, and thus also in Eccl. 8, 10; cf. AJSL 22, 255, below; contrast GK ${ }^{2 i}$, $\S 119$, ii; $\mathrm{GB}^{14}, 174^{\mathrm{b}} .316^{\text {b }} ; \operatorname{BDB} 486^{\text {b }}, 3$. When one of the new inmates of the harem was sent to the King, she could get anything she required for this purpose, e. g. dresses, jewelry, \&c. These things were, of course, not provided while she passed from the harem to the palace of the King (as S supposes) but before she left the harem; and when she came back from the King, she was probably obliged to return the jewelry \&c to Shaashgaz or Hegai.
(14) fit cannot mean a second time (B). It does not stand for שׁת (cf. n. in Baer's edition, p. 72, below). Nor need we, with S,
 the second) is a gloss (omitted in \&) just as $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ ? odalisques who had spent a night with the King were not transferred to another harem, as the glossator supposed; they returned to the same house, but they were henceforth under the care of another chamberlain
 with special consideration, inasmuch as any one of them might become the mother of a royal prince.
 Ša'-šě-gaz, not Sha'ashgaz; just as
 ša'-țě-néz,* not ša-'aț-nez (AJSL 22, 258).
 Pur. 42, 18; cf. фабүа for фабта (9, 7). For 「aı=-17 see nn. on v. 3.

 quent addition (derived from v. 7 and from the gloss 9,29 ) which severs

[^6] the author had intended to gire the name of E＇s father，he would hare mentioned it in $5.7 . \mathfrak{G}^{r}$ calls E again（ $c f$ ．nn．on 7 ）Өvyát $\eta \rho \mathrm{A} \mu \epsilon \iota v a \delta a \beta$

 For means kinsmen of a noble man；see AJSL 18，214；BL 26，đ．Both
 the fact that E＇s father mas a distinguished man，an البر الاكابر ；cf． the names

The fact that E did not ask for anything，but took only what Hegai suggested，does not show her wisdom and her modesty（B）but her superior beauty．S thinks this incident illustrates E＇s modesty；he adds， howerer，zugleich machte ihre Schōnheit allen weiteren Schmuck über－ flussig（similarly Wd）．

For กล゙ּ：see Kings 119，24；cf．VG 49，$\beta$ ．
（16）For $\boldsymbol{\Sigma ニ ั ゙ ~ ( B a b y l . ~ T ̦ e b e ̂ t u , ~ s t e m ~ シ ニ u ) * ~ s e e ~ m y ~ A s s y r . ~ E - v o u r e l ~}$ （Baltimore，1881）p．11；cf．ZDMG 61，284，below．For the tenth mouth， Tebeth， $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{v}}$ has the twelfth month，Adar．In $\delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \varphi$ has subse－ quently been corrected to $\delta є к а ́ \tau \varphi$, ，and $A \delta a \rho$ to $T \eta \beta \eta \theta$ ．§ substitutes $\approx=10$ （


 ．
 requies）nor a day of rest，holiday（ $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{S}$ ）nor exemption from military

 24 and C 73，6）but release of prisoners（Matt．27，15）．Demetrius I （ $162-150$ в．с．）promised to release all Jerrish captires in his kingdom （ $1 \times 10,33$ ）．If $\mathfrak{G}$ ä $\phi \in \sigma \iota s$ meant remission of taxes，it would be an Alexandrian adaptation，just as $\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \theta \rho o v i \sigma \theta \eta(1,2)$ ．Remission of taxes at festive occasions was customary under the reign of the Ptolemies，but not in the Persian empire or in the Seleucidan kingdom．The promises of Demetrius I（ 1 M 10，25－45）were extraragant，and Jonathan and his people gave no credit unto them．＊Avєбıs（ $\phi$ ópov）mould be more appro－ priate than ä $\phi \epsilon \sigma t s$ ．Oriental kings are，as a rule，loath to relinquish any

[^7]taxes; nor would an Oriental monarch ever give 10,000 talents to his grand vizier (see $\alpha d$ 3,11). Release of prisoners, even a general pardon, or amnesty, is less costly.* $\mathfrak{f f}$ is inf. abs. instead of the finite

 Tivivi cf. Nah. 25, below; 27, below, and contrast n. on 7 า $(9,6)$. The infinitives $-\boldsymbol{T}$
 iqâma, \&c.

Instead of the singular nivo (Wd, S: Getreidespende; cf. Jer.
 from the royal table or messes (see Pur. 47, 11). The nouns תiviv, תیiviza,
 B says,
 8, 2, 7; cf. ibid. 3 and Anab. 1, 9, 25) is correct, but not gift of grain
 tion, ration.

A glossator who misunderstood תNiw to mean tribute (cf. 2 Chr. $\mathbf{2 4}, 6.9) \dagger$ added the gloss which we find in $f \mathfrak{f l}$ at the beginning of c. $\mathbf{1 0}$, where it is connected neither with what precedes nor with what follows, just as we find at the end of the Book of Canticles two disconnected misplaced glosses, viz. 12, 13 (belonging to 2,14 ) and 12,14 (which belongs to 2,17). See remarks on misplaced incorrect glosses in ZDMG 61, 297, 1. 20; Nah. 43 (vv. 11.6) and 41; also 30 (v. 4) and 25 (v. 11). Cf.nn. on 3,$7 ; 9,16$.

According to AoF 3, 26 the King levied the tax after he had repealed the decree to exterminate the Jews, because he wanted the money which $H$ had promised to pay for the prisilege of exterminating the Jews. AoF 3, 27 the statement Tran is said to be meaningless; it is suggested that we should read
 Seleucia; תNivg (or Nivig) is supposed to be merely a rariant of $\mathbf{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, meaning impost; v. 18 is taken to be the introduction to 10,1 , which should therefore be transferred to c. 10 , the eleration of $E$ to the queenship being the final climax.-This is all gratuitous.

[^8](19) VV. 19 f . is not an émávodos or retrogressio, as Grotius says, but a gloss added by some one who deemed it necessary to explain the
 also the final clause of the preceding verse,
 av̉ $\hat{\eta}$, which means, according to W 18, below, he had a high position at the royal court (cf. 11, 3; 12, 5) but $\theta$ єрarevév may mean also to pay a visit (cf. $\theta$ epatev́evv tàs $\theta$ v́pas $\tau \iota v o ́ s) ~ \& c$. It is not necessary to suppose that M had an official position at the royal court (cf. C 75, 8; contrast 135, below). He may have been a have had a money-changer's table at the King's Gate, i. e. apparently (according to 4, 2.6) the gateway* leading from the City to the Acropolis; cf. last n. on c. 3. The King's Gate of Susa, it may be supposed, corresponded in some respects to the Propylcea of Athens. But according to $\mathbb{U}^{2}(259,27)$ the gate was between the royal palace and the harem





(20) This verse contains two tertiary glosses to M
 15; 2 (1) seems to be misplaced; it should be inserted in v. 22 (see below). According to 1,10 (where תרש has been displaced by the gloss
 the - שוּ ence between chamberlains and members of the body-guard.

Heb. 50 is a loanword=Babyl. sippu; for instead of sipp


According to AoF 3,5 the discovery of the conspiracy is out of place in this connection; it should have been given in the beginning, as in $\mathfrak{G}$. This theory, however, is gratuitous. $C f$. the last but one paragraph of nn. on שוֹחוֹ $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$.
(22) ffl cannot be the original reading, although the Ancient Versions have

 for ffl 72n, everything becomes perfectly natural and consistent; see Pur.

[^9]
 text originated I cannot tell．We have a similar confusion of names＊in
 に：ニゴー，and we find a similar transposition in $1 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{10,1} 1$ where the clause $ー$ ール゙ the remarks on misplaced glosses in Nah．cited above，in nn．on v .18 and the remarks on transpositions，Nah． 37.
（23）fit （B）not they were hanged（Reuss，Wd，S）．Cf．Herod．3，159；also Josh． 8，29；10，26．The King says in 7，9：תמלחּ ，i．e．impale him upon it．Nor does mean to hang（see Numbers 59，51）．©
 true that ${ }^{\text {esofl means，as a rule，to be crucified } \dagger \text {（especially in the NT；}}$ $\boldsymbol{L}_{\boldsymbol{L}-\boldsymbol{p}}=\operatorname{lnc}_{3}$ ）but Assyr．zuqqupu means to impale；cf．KAT ${ }^{2}, 378$. 616．Gibbeting of the offender，or part of the offender，after death is in Assyrian ina gašissi alâlu，to tie to a stake（AJSL 1，230；HW 70 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ．
 the upright stake to which the delinquent was bound，when no tree was at hand，or on which he was impaled（see Pur．6，23）．
 negative： tive is，of course，impossible（ $c f .6,2$ ）but $\equiv$ Ho shows that the translator realized the difficulties in the received text．
fal be presented（or submitted）to the King；at the disposal of the King （cf．Gen．24，51）or for the King，so that they might be＂פ玉 ל ם＂אาp T－an（ 6,1 ）．The King had given orders to record all important events so that he might have an accurate account of all that had happened whenever he called for it．If extracts from newspapers are collected アンロー＂ read all the clippings．Similarly we find in the gloss 3，7：לan
 that the lot be cast so that he might learn the result，but it is not necessary to suppose that $\mathbf{H}$ was present while the lot was cast；contrast Pur．15，5．Cf．also BL 117，below，and Mal．3，16；Is．65， 6.

[^10]We must add at the end of c． 2 the statement
 ＂（cf．3，4；4，4；GK ${ }^{27}$ ，§ 8117 ，f）．Nor need we substitute （2 K 17，4）．

う

立in v．10；so，too， $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {L }}$ ．H represents the name of the prin－ cipal deity of the Elamites（contrast n．on ${ }^{2}$ ，2，5）Humba， Humman，Amman，\＆c（see Pur．10，24）．The double $m$ of this ancient Elamite（or Susian）name is preserved in certain MSS of $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {b }}$ （ $\mathbf{A} \mu \mu a v$ ）．Also the name of H＇s father（ $\boldsymbol{N}$ dathus）is not Persian，but connected with the name of the chief deity of the Elamites．The initial $\pi$ of is certainly not the article （LB Medatha）cf． $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ 「au for $\boldsymbol{\square}$（see $a d$ 2，3）．The $u$－vowel of Hum－
 son combined H with＇$\Omega \mu$ ár $\quad$ ps． $\mathfrak{F}^{\wedge} \mathrm{A} \mu a \nu$ in Tob．14， 10 is a subsequent corruption or adaptation（Pur．51，5）． $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ has there $\mathrm{A} \delta \alpha \mu, \mathfrak{G}^{\mathfrak{s}} \mathrm{N} \alpha \delta \alpha \beta$ ． Nadab is given also in the Vetus Latina，while the Syriac Version has ＇Akab；cf．EB 5112 and the various readings in Tob．11， 18.

H is neither Persian nor Hebrew（Pur．12，16）．In the apocryphal

 12） H is called $\boldsymbol{\imath \pi \epsilon \rho \dot { \eta } \phi a v o s ~ ( c f . ~ A J S L ~ 2 3 , ~ 2 3 5 , ~ 1 . ~ 6 ) ~ b u t ~ i n ~ t h e ~ c o r r e s p o n d - ~}$ ing verse of $\mathfrak{G}^{\llcorner }(5,15$ in L＇s edition）à $\pi \in \rho i \tau \mu \eta \tau o s$. He may have been an officer of the（colored）Susian body－guard of the Persian kings（Pur． $38,5)$ ．
 cf．below）is a subsequent adaptation of the original＂דנה，the Gagean or northern barbarian；see Ezekiel 99，32．Cf．the remarks on $\delta$ Mov－
 the Greek period）all the Greek Versions have $\Gamma \omega \gamma=\mathbf{N} \mathbf{N}$ instead of ג゙ some MSS（Pur．42，14）of $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {b }}$ has been replaced by $\beta$ ovyaios，which is not a gentilicium（Bovyaios）but the Homeric term of reproach ßovyáios braggart，lit．boasting like a bull；see Pur．13．H＇s contemporary pro－ totype（Pur．12，3．9）Nicanor（see Nah．26）was a braggart；cf． 1 M 7， 34.47 and the Talmudic passage Taanith $18^{\text {b }}$（Pur．5，27）also the remark on $\mathfrak{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \phi a v o s$ in the preceding paragraph of the present n ．In $5,12 \mathfrak{G}^{\text {b }}$



Nicanor is a common Macedonian name．In 9,$24 ; 16,10 \mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ substi－
 i．e．the descendant of Agag，the king of the Amalekites（ $\mathbb{C} ニ シ ョ$
 hewn in pieces before Jhvн at Gilgal by Samuel（ $1 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{15,33)} \mathrm{whereas} \mathrm{M}$ is introduced as a descendant of the first king of Israel（see ad 2，6）． Josephus，therefore，calls H an Amalekite；cf．L，Purim 50 and IN 389. The reading＂אֹה instead of must have been established in the first cent．в．о．








 šân，Assyr．šênu，shoe；see $a d 1,5$.

For Wn＇s untenable combination of N（＝＝シiol with Assyr． agâgu and Arab．چچ̣ hajjâj，tyrant see Pur．42， 21.

From the Greek point of view the Macedonians were northern bar－ barians，and the Jews regarded the Samaritans as northern barbarians． This explains why $H$ is called both a Macedonian and a Gagean；it also throws some light on the epithet of John Hyrcanus（cf．W 36，below）． This Maccabean prince conquered the Samaritans and destroyed the temple on Mt．Gerizim in 128 в．с．Hyrcanus may mean Conqueror of the Hyrcanians，i．e．Samaritans；cf．Scipio Africanus，\＆c．＊The Samaritans，it may be supposed，were called Hyrcanians owing to the admixture of foreign colonists from the North（cf． In the Talmud the Samaritans are called Cutheans（ロック）i．e．inhabi－ tants of Cutha，NE of Babylon．H corresponds，in some respects，to Sanballat，Tobiah，and Geshem；see Pur．52， 16.
（2）For the meaning of $c f$ ．JAOS 22， 73.

[^11] rank $\cap 7{ }^{2}$; see ad 1,15 .

 ภาผาป, 5, 2.9) but ロาวละ means in (spite of) their saying; cf.

fit

 incorrect glosses ef. Nah. 41, 1. 3; 43, 1. 7; ZDMG 61, 297, n. 115. fit
 attitude ( $\mathbf{3}$ utrum perseveraret in sententia; LB ob solches Thun Mardachais bestehen würde). M's Jewish extraction was probably unmistakable so that it was unnecessary for him to tell any one that he was a Jew. He was known as 10 and n. on 2, 19).* E, on the other hand, may have been an Oriental beauty without any pronounced Jewish features so that she was able to conceal her extraction (cf. n. on 2, 10). The fact that M was a Jew would be no satisfactory explanation for his refusal to prostrate himself before H. The ancient Israelites did not object to the $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa$ viv $\eta \sigma \iota$; cf.
 before H was different (see Pur. 37,40 ; cf. n. on 7, 6). Similarly M's ancestor, Shimei, of the family of Saul, refused to bow before David, and threw stones at him, although the King was surrounded by his bodyguard; and the King did not punish him, just as H disdains to punish M, fearing, perhaps, that M's services in connection with the discovery of the conspiracy against the King would become known, if he tried to punish M (see Pur. 12, 40). If H succeeded in obtaining permission for a general massacre of all the Jews (cf. AJSL 23, 225, n. 4) the killing of M would attract no attention ( $c f$. also C 93, 21). Certain Russian officials would adopt the same course in the $20^{\text {th }}$ century; see Pur. 35,$9 ; 43,18$. 27. 32. 46; 44, 1.

 $c f$. second n . on v. 4. Both glosses are omitted in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ which reads for v .




*A Schnorver is said to have introduced himself to a distinguished Jewish banker of Berlin, stating, Mein Name ist Hirsch, whereupon the banker replied, Das seh' ich. See the cut representing Jewish captives in Assyria on p. 203 of Wellhausen's translation of the Psalms in the Polychrome Bible.

 －אד etymology of $\begin{aligned} \text { ang ，which is just as fanciful as the Biblical explana－}\end{aligned}$
 ブニージ לคの in Dan．5，26－28；see Pur．2，37；15，21；18，17；SFG 25，
 is explained to mean lot is a subsequent addition．

The emendation of Grotius and Fritzsche，$\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \rho \omega$ instead of $\dot{\imath} \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ in the apocryphal addition 16,22 ，is rery doubtful；it is not probable that the characteristic $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta_{\rho \omega \nu}$ should have been corrupted to $\dot{\imath} \mu \omega \nu$（cff．the
 9，16；ユミー for ジこの in nn．on 8，10；also AJSL 22，197， 1.15 and Nah．
 mean among the feasts named after yourselves（i．e．according to C．J． Ball，$\dagger$ among your ou＇n Persian festivals or as if the word Purim

 $\mu o s \& c)$ ．This institution existed among the Assyrians and Babylo－ nians．The cuneiform term for eponymy is limu；see HW 379；cf． the Lists of Eponyms in KB 1，204－214；also AoF 3，10．12； $\mathrm{KAT}^{3}$ ， 331 （l．9）and 518；OLZ 10，332；see also Delitzsch，Mehr Licht （Leipzig，1907）p． 9.

According to a tradition recorded by Berûni Purim may be the day on which the offices were assigned（اليوم النى ينتقال فيx الاعهال）
 tion by lot；see ZDMG 61，275．Assyr．karâru ša pûri（Pur．20， below）seems to mean to set up the urn（кадíбкоs）holding the lots to be drarn for the various offices，and this cuneiform puru（ $\mathrm{HW} 169^{\text {b }}$ ：buru） urn（кá入 $\pi เ$ ）may be connected with Heb．ำาำ．pot，lit．boiler（a form

 חクリミ，wine－press，originally rat ；cf．the cut in the translation of Joshua （SBOT）p． 68 and my translation of Is．63，1－6 in JHCC，No．163，p． $49^{\text {a }}$ ． According to J．D．Michaelis Nicanor＇s Day might have been called ロクワワミ，because the Syrian army was crushed at Adasa as grapes are pressed in a wine－vat；see Pur．51， 38.

[^12]For $ก$ ำท，wine－vat cf．also Hag．2，15． 16 where we must read：－


בアット לx 16 （ $\beta$ ）
For $\because$ ，how？cf． how？（see n．on $N \mathbb{N}, ~ 1,12$ ）．For $\mathbb{N} \frac{7}{T}$ ，in the second couplet，read Ni．（cf．Hag．1，9）．The omission of Tin in the second hemistich of v． 16 is due to the omission of－n in the last hemistich；contrast
 $(7,8)$ ．The omission of the prefixed $\boldsymbol{2}$ before $\pi \rightarrow 9$ is due to haplo－ graphy；for the enjambement＊in the last line cf．AJSL 23， 240 and the second line of Nah．2， 11 （Nah．50）．

 sors in urnam quae Hebraice dicitur phur．The translation of
 cast a ballot，that is a lot，кai in this connection is explicative and cor－
 in the present passage see below，n．on b픈．

There is no Persian word for lot from which 71 ＝＝blai could be
 nor could they appear in Heb．as 77 ．The Iranian word for lot is

 with 7 ，urn it was merely a subsequent popular etymology which may have been suggested to a glossator by the use of $\Omega_{T}+\frac{Q}{\square}$ ，part，por－ tion in the sense of lot，destiny $\dagger$ as well as by the oracular practices observed on New Year＇s eve（Pur．17，38；18，27；21，33；cf．also C 101，8） and the allotting of offices at the beginning of the year（AoF 3，10）．

Lostage（Days of the Lots）is the Ger．term for days on which it is possible to forecast the future（Pur．18，28）．At the Chinese New Year＇s

[^13]festival the priest produces a box with small ivory chips variously inscribed．If the lot marked wisdom comes out，it means more wisdom for the man for whom the lot is drawn．Similar oracular practices may have prevailed at the celebration of the Persian New Year（Naurôz）in the times of the Maccabees．Cf．the statement of Berâni，quoted in ZDMG 61，277，on the same day（Naurôz＝Purim）the happy lots are distributed among the people of the earth（السعاداء）تقسه
 Atonement＊may be a purified form of some Babyl．oracular practice at the beginning at the second half of the year（Pur．3，39；4，2．20．26．33； 33,$14 ; 49,26$ ）．

E is a festal legend for Nicanor＇s Day，just as the Book of Nahum is a festal liturgy for the celebration of that great victory gained by Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor on the $13^{\text {th }}$ of Adar， 161 в．с．（OLZ 10，64； ZDMG 61，275）．This commemoration of Nicanor＇s Day was combined with the observation of the Persian Nerv Year＇s festival（celebrated at the time of the vernal equinox）which is no doubt based on the Babyl． New Year＇s festival（Pur．3，3；4，39；11，27；19，10）．In the Talmud the cuneiform name of the New Year＇s Festival，akitu，aqîtu $\dagger$ appears as



The original meaning of ang（ $_{\text {（ }}$ Naurôz $=$ Akitu）is not lots， but portions，Heb．תา⿰丬⿳

In casting lots in order to determine what day would be most unlucky for the Jews and therefore most auspicious for the general massacre planned by H（cf．L，Purim，p．8，l．13）they did not try every single day of the year until they finally hit on the $13^{\text {th }}$ day of the $12^{\text {th }}$ month．They might have put 12 lots，marked from 1 to 12 ，into the urn （Assyr．pûru）and 30 lots marked from 1 to 30 ；then it was only neces－
 that this simple procedure was not used at that time．They tried first the first day，then the second，and so forth；when the lot decided in favor of the $13^{\text {th }}$ day，they tried to determine the month．In this way it was necessary to cast the lot 25 times before they hit on the $13^{\text {th }}$ day of the $12^{\text {th }}$ month．Cf．my remarks on Urim and Thummim in JBL 19，

[^14]73, n. 61 and Numbers 57, 41. Adar means dvyaios in Assyrian; the

ff לaxh is impersonal; so Keil, Schultz, R in K, S; LB ward das Loos geworfen vor $H$; cf. the translation in $\mathfrak{3}$, quoted above, missa est sors, and the translation of Leviticus (SBOT) p. 62, 1. 54; see also Kings
 necessary to read, with $O$, וחהּ





 (2,23). According to $\mathbb{T}^{2}$ the lots were cast by the scribe Shimshai (cf. Ezra 4, 8.17. 23 and C 103). $\mathbb{J}^{2}$ also states ( $a d$ 6,1) that the King commanded the scribe Shimshai to bring the Book of Records. $\&$ has
 (Syr. $1_{5}{ }^{9}$ is apparently a transposition of $\psi \hat{\eta} \phi o s ;$ see Pur. 45, 11). For the translation of this clause in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{A}}$ see Pur. 16, 1. $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{L}}$ has каi
 Nıซav represents a variant (cf. last n. on 1, 4) to A $\delta a \rho$ (it may be derived from $\mathrm{ffl}^{7} \mathrm{~F}^{\circ} \mathrm{g}$ at the beginning of this verse).

After fft whe we must, with $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}$ in K , Wd, following $\mathfrak{G}$ каi ${ }_{\mathrm{c}}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \beta \alpha$ -


 skipped this clause owing to the repetition of the word לחדשׁ. Keil, Rawlinson, Schultz regard this plus of $\mathfrak{G}$ as an interpolation from v. 13; nor has S inserted it in his translation. The clause $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \AA$ áno入є́ $\sigma a \iota$ тò $\gamma^{\text {Évos }}$ Mapooxaiov (which I have enclosed in parentheses) seems to be a subsequent addition in $\mathfrak{G}$, which we need not insert in the Heb. text. O, however, prefixes אח - על

In the same way, the fourteenth day, given in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$, may be a subsequent correction for the thirteenth day (so $\mathfrak{S}^{\text {L }}$; see above). In 8,$12 ; 9,1$ $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ has the thirteenth just as $\mathfrak{f t}$. In the apocryphal additions $\mathfrak{G}$ has the fourteenth day in 13, 6; but the thirteenth in 16, 20 (Pur. 15, 11). $C f$. also n . on $9,17$.
(8) For ทֹּ we must point $14,347$.

For ply $\delta_{\iota \epsilon \sigma \pi \alpha \rho \mu}{ }^{\prime} v o v$, but it would be a mistake to suppose that one of these
participles in fas due to scribal expansion．© repeatedly substitutes one verb for two or three verbs of 5 f；cf．n．on v． 13.
 § 133，e）．
（9）The conjecture（AoF 3，26）that aTニN is a gloss，and that we
 ל is not Heb．What Wn has in mind
 gestion that こごー in v． 11 is a gloss is correct；see below and $c f$ ．above， ad 2，18．The interpretation（W 17）that $\mathbf{H}$ offers the King 10.000 talents to make up the financial loss involved in the extermination of the people（loss of taxes）is unwarranted；cf．below，ad 7， 4.

Heb．לpu to pay，properly to weigh，may be a Babyl．loanword；cf．
 initial $\uplus$ is therefore a $\uplus_{3}$（SFG 20， 3 ；ZDMG 34， 861 ；BAL 100；con－

 ＝Assyr．Aššur；عثنت＝Ištar，\＆c；see my paper on the name Istar in JAOS 28，118，below．
fft officers（cf．the remarks on الاعهال，ZDMG 61，275）．Also in 1 K 11， 28； 2 K 12， 12 （contrast Kings 240，20）as well as in Neh．13，10；Ezr．3， 9 \＆e עe means business man（cf．$\psi 107,23$ ）especially finan－ cier，tax－gatherer，collector，\＆c．Cf．also 1 S 8，16；Dan．8，27； 1 Chr． 29， 6.
（10）For צ $\mathbb{E}$ has hín The addition $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {vL }}$ ，seems to be a scribal expansion；see n ．on v． 1 ．
 should exchange places（ $c f$ ．n．on 1，6）and こごー should be relegated to the margin（Pur． 6,33 ）as the question of a reader who was anxious to know what became of the enormous amount of money（ 10,000 talents， i．e．about $\$ 18,000,000$ ）．Cf．for this gloss Kings 137，35；Isaiah 19，$\beta$ ； 81，18；Eccl．20，$\chi ; 21, \epsilon ; 25, \kappa \kappa$ ；BL $3, \gamma$ ．The King takes it for granted that $H$ will pay the money into the royal treasury；he therefore deems
 extremely unlikely that an Oriental monarch should be so generous as to turn over eighteen million dollars to his prime minister；$c f . \mathbf{n}$ ．on $\mathbf{2}, 18$.

 on ロックロッ゙ー（ 8,10 ）

Heb．תin is a Babyl．loanword．The singular must be pronounced pěxxáh（GK ${ }^{27}, \S 27, q$ ）not pêxâh（AOG 25）．The doub－
 one； 7 N，after，\＆c．In Assyr．paxâtu，pixatu（HW 519b）the guttural is not doubled．


 originally runners，then especially foot－soldiers；see Kings 232， 34. Here it is used for couriers（äy ${ }^{\prime}$ apol，$c f$ ．Her． 8,98 ）who were（according

 is used for envoy，and allakuxanțu for courier（HW619b．281b）．The stem xamâtu，to burn is identical with the stem xamâțu，to hasten； the original meaning is to flash；cf．ZDMG 61，297，n． 115 and modern Arab．

fatinn וֹ フィッゼーb，to exterminate is the general term（cf．v． 6 and 4，18）．This extermination could be effected either by a general massacre（\％M）or by forcing the surviving Jews to flee from the country like wild beasts； cf．Arab．توحش＝ابـل and my remarks on the last line of $\psi 1$ in AJSL 19，141，below．See also n．on $\boldsymbol{1}$（ 9,6 ）and C 121，below．At the time of the Syrian persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes and his suc－ cessors the orthodox Jews were either massacred（ $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{1,57.63;2,38;}$ cf．Pur．35， 6 and n．on ロージ่ ，4，7）or forced to flee（ $1 \mathrm{M} 2,28.29 .43$ ；


 For the accumulation of synonyms，which is by no means indicative of a late date，cf．ZDMG 61，295，n． 97.

Heb．לשל，to plunder（cf．8，11）is a Babyl．loanword．The noun
 property，just as Ger．Plunder means household effects，trumpery， baggage，while the verb plündern means to pillage．In certain parts of the United States the term plunder does not mean pillage，spoil，booty， but household or personal effects，baggage，luggage．Ger．plündern is a privative denominative like our to skin \＆e（AJSL 22，251；Nah．32）． Assyr．šalâlu（HW 662 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ）means to carry off；so לְש denotes mov－ ables；French meubles；cf．the Ger．privative denominative vermöbeln． See also Pur．34， 18.

The conjecture（AoF 3，26）that this verse is evidently a subsequent （post－Seleucidan）addition is gratuitous．
（14）The clause
 but not（S）．Nor is Wd right in stating that $\boldsymbol{T}$（ the contents of the edict．$\$$ renders freely：＝anal iods，onfero ．
fft


 would have been useless，if published eleven months in advance，since the Jews would have had ample time to emigrate，is not valid（cf．C 124）． If a general massacre of the Jews in a Russian city were announced a year in advance，the Jews could not all get away；and even if they were able to take most of their personal property，they could not dispose of their real estate．Cf．Pur．43，7．22．27．39． 43.
 Th．ליחם，is a subsequent addition，and that the first part of v． 14 is the immediate sequel of v .12 ，is impossible．
（15）The conception（AoF 3，26）that the couriers are sent out twice， is erroneous； $\mathrm{vv} .12-14$ describe the drafting of the edict，and v .15 relates the execution of the order．

㲧 City of Susa in distinction from the Acropolis（■ヷニーラ）．The King and H feasted in the Acropolis；cf．n．on 1，2．The people in the Acropolis were not perplexed，but the people in the City were in a quandary． 3 et cunctis Judceis，qui in urbe erant，flentibus seems to have regarded the
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 of the edict as soon as it was decided upon．Just as he managed to obtain information concerning $\mathrm{E}(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1 1})$ so his friends at the Court apprised him of H＇s scheme．

Heb．קú is a Babyl．loanword；of． $\mathrm{KAT}^{3}, 650$ ．It denotes a coarse loin－cloth；see Kings 163，n．＊；210，7，and cf．Glaser in OLZ 9， 320.
 $\sigma \pi$ oסóv，\＆i
 rem capiti；but we should not be justified in inserting



 not used only of dresses；לֹビ
 ．For the symbolical meaning of the rend－ ing of garments and the sprinkling of ashes \＆c see Pur． 25.
fity
 3 aulam regis intrare is inaccurate．
 and ashes）means Most of them had a sack－cloth（or coarse loin－cloth） and overspread（Ger．aufgeschmierte）ashes（i．e．spread orer the body）．

 －anּ C＇s rendering（eren）the great ones is impossible．The אבּל גדול וֹוֹם年 were unirersal among the Jews，and most of them eren put on the loin－cloth and sprinkled ashes on their head．Instead of发？we must point （ $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 53, \mathrm{~s}$ ）．For $\mathfrak{f t}$ ，instead of cf．conclusion of n．on
 5,12 ）but the $ל$ explained in WdG 2，149，D；nor is rerbal predi－ cate to both $\mathcal{P}$ and $\boldsymbol{7 E s}$ ，but attribute to $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { E s }}$ ．B and $\mathbb{T} d$（follow－ ing 3 sacco et cinere multis pro strato utentibus）think that they spread a garment of hair－cloth，sprinkled with ashes，on the ground and sat down on this garment；so too，S：Sack und Asche hatte die Menge（der
 this spreading of the sack－cloth on the ground would be at rariance with the disregard for personal comfort，which is characteristic of mourning． The sack－cloth was not spread on the ground，but put on as a loin－cloth， and the ashes were not sprinkled on the loin－cloth，but over the body． $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {b }}$ has for

 and put on a loin－cloth．This explains why persons in mourning were not allowed to approach the King＇s Gate．Afterwards they simply tore

[^15]their garments at the breast for a hand＇s breadth and put on the loin－ cloth under their ordinary garments（Kings 210，7）．
 the verbs $\Pi^{\prime \prime}$ ל and $\mathbb{N}^{\prime \prime}$ ；cf． based on the analogy of the verbs ${ }^{\prime \prime \prime}$＂（see n．in the paper on the name Istar in JAOS 28，113）．
fit grieved）means the Queen was very much shocked．The use of T－コンan
 is designed．M was stripped of all clothing save the coarse loin－cloth．＊ This was distasteful to the Queen（ $c f .2$ S 6，20）．She therefore tried to induce $M$ to put on the garments she sent him． $\mathscr{G}^{\text {V }}$ has ėtapáx $\theta_{\eta}$ for


 derived from שיׁק；see Nah． 41.
 glosses in 9，23． 27 and n．on 1 （7，4）．Assyr．qablu，midst（BL 97） ＝Arab．qalb，heart（AJSL 1，227）；cf．last n．on 7， 9.
（5）For 7 Пn（ $\$, 2 \pi$ with 7 misread $;$ ）has＇Axpa日cios．This is a transposition of＇A $\theta a \chi \alpha \hat{0} \mathrm{o}$ ，the $\rho$ emphasizing the guttural（velar）character of the $\overline{7}$ ；see BA 1，257，1．18．For ó＇A $\quad$ päaîos（v．9）cf．n．on ó Movðaîos $(1,14)$ and for the transposition $c f$ ．the remarks on A $\gamma a \theta a s=\Gamma a \beta o v \theta a s=$
 like＇А Хátทs，＇A $\chi \rho a ́ \delta \eta s, ~ \& c$.
fflunir is causative（ 3 quem rex ministrum ei dederat，AV whom he had appointed to attend $\dagger$ upon her）just as ברקT in 2，14；it could
 83， 50.
 and nn ．on 1，17．The phrase 3 ． correct in vv． 8.17 and in 2，10；means to order to，to order to go to．This is a constructio prægnans $\left(\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 119\right.$ ，ee）like $\mathrm{\delta s} . . .$. ． アグコース（7，7）
（7）The translation（AoF 3，26）$M$ told him everything，and the amount of money which $H$ had commanded to pay to the Jeus $\ddagger$ in order to annihilate them；he gave him also the tenor of the edict which he had issued in Susa in order to exterminate them，is impossible．

Heb．ロックาก゙ニ ลาคய゙ cannot mean to pay to the Jews；＊コ is the ユ pretii（see Kings 224，5）3 pro Judooorum nece．In his nn．S explains
 means properly als Preis für die Juden，but in his translation he renders in Betreff der Juden．There are several discrepancies beitween the translation and the nn．in S＇s commentary，which would，perhaps，have been eliminated，if S had been able to revise his work；cf．nn．on 1，20； $5,1.8 ; 6,6 ; 7,8 ; 8,11 ; 9,2.16 .26$ ；also S＇s transliteration Mordehai （as though it were $\boldsymbol{\square} \boldsymbol{\Pi า า \% ) ~ a n d ~ P u r . ~ 2 9 , ~} 26$.

For the Kethiv בַּיהּ

fitax means here to ruin them；this includes killing and pro－ scription，banishment，expulsion with confiscation of property（ $c f . \mathrm{n}$ ．on 3，13）．
（8）The Athnah in 的 לִ

 the document and to tell her about it，explain it to her（AV to show it unto $E$ and declare it unto her）．Hatach told the Queen the substance of the edict，although he presented a copy of the decree．Even if E could read the copy，she was probably satisfied with the verbal report． An official who submits a letter to his superior will often give the sub－ stance of it，so that the letter is not read，although it is produced．The clause וֹepresents the final request：M requests Hatach to urge $\mathbf{E}$ ，in view of all the evidence submitted，to go to the King． The eunuch Hatach may have been a Jew；cf．C 145 and the second footnote to n ．on 2， 10 ．
（11）For the etymology of $\Omega$ neng cf．AJSL 22，258，below．
For דחד דח Tinn wir The suffix in int represents the genitivus objectivus（so S）：his decree＝the decree against him；contrast n．on 1，17．The
 $\mathrm{SG}^{2}$, p． 57 ，below．
 Lamed inscriptionis，as in Is．8， $1\left(\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 119, \mathrm{u}\right)$ ．This is a variety of
 oratio directa is a variety of the emphatic ma（see Proverbs 68,7 ）．$G^{\mathrm{V}}$
 cunctatione statim interficiatur；LB der soll stracks Gebot sterben．
 so the $r$ is merely resolution of the doubling（VG，$\S 90$ ）as in Assyr．

[^16]kursa (cf. Aram. פורז", Arab. كسی) =kussa (Heb. Noま) throne
 the $\mathbf{Z}$ should have a Dagesh lene; the Raphéh may be disregarded, just as in לi ל ל ל ל ל (Ruth 2, 14). For Masoretic endorsements of manifest textual errors see Kings 288, 19; 298, 12. Cf. also of

AVे these thirty days = (note Gen. 31, 38: AV this twenty years = (זו עשרים שנחו is a Hebraism. It means lit. This is thirty days, i. e. for the past thirty days; cf. French il $y$ a and $\mathrm{GB}^{14}$, $174^{\mathrm{b}}$, b; BDB $261^{\mathrm{b}}$, i.
 Biblia Hebraica, or ${ }^{2}\left(\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 121\right.$, a).
(13) For this third message of M to his foster-daughter in the royal harem cf. Otanes' third message to his daughter Phædymia (Herod. 3,
 and n . on $2,12$.
fft בבית הבמלך is haplography for (see nn. on 1,9). It cannot be appositive to "ת ת/ת, als dem Könighause angehörig (S).


(14) $\mathfrak{f f t}$ does not mean vielmehr (S) but for; ${ }^{2}$ must be connected, not with the following conditional (or concessive) clause introduced by אם, but with אמז ובית אביך תאבדו. The author might

 text is no doubt original.



The scriptio plena יעבווד may be due to dittography of the 7; see
 fit ${ }^{7}$ means wird erstehen (Keil, K) not wird bestehen (B). The meaning is not, the deliverance is established and certain, but it will


 per aliam occasionem liberabuntur Judœi.
$\mathfrak{f t ~}$ as $S$ supposes. Eren in the $20^{\text {th }}$ century it is hardly possible for the Jews in Russia to get any help from abroad, e. $g$. the United States or England. From another place or from some other quarter is a veiled allusion to God. The avoidance of the name of God is certainly not
accidental（N）but intentional（Wd）．According to N（EB 1403）it is due to the coarse and worldly spirit of the author；but the avoidance of the name of God is no evidence of coarseness or worldliness：a man may be absolutely irreligious，yet use the name of God in an oath \＆c．The
 tion on the part of the Supreme Being，just as some one may say in Washington，The Secretary of State is in favor of it，but Somebody Else may object，alluding to the President．＊In post－Biblical Hebrew，םาp：an is used of God（ $c f$ ．JBL 24，17）and אלקים is substituted for just as we prefer to say By Jove，or dear me，or Good gracious，Good by， \＆c in order to avoid the name of God．Ger．achherrje is a corruption of Ach Herr Jesus，just as Hullee gee is a corruption of Holy Jesus．
ff תly whether thou hast not attained royalty for a time like this，i．e．Perhaps thou hast been made Queen just for such a contingency；cf．Gen．45，7；
 quis novit utrum idcirco ad regnum veneris，ut in tali tempore para－ reris？\＆i＜as） ש אnlゴン

 grammar（1899）p．343；English translation by J．A．Crichton（London， 1907）p．387．For similarly clipped forms $c f$ ．my remarks on the causa－ tive prefix 4 in nn．on 3， 9 and in the paper on the name Istar（JAOS 28， 114）also Nah．24，below：VG $\S 44, d$ ；and the remarks on $\prod_{T}^{T 1 / 2}(5,8)$ ．
ffl haud scio an non＝perhaps not．As soon as the negative is inserted （after art）in AV Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this，the meaning is clear．LB，correctly，Wer weiss， ob du nicht um dieser Zeit willen zum Königreich gekommen bist；C und wer weiss，ob du nicht（grade）für diese Zeit zum Königreich gelangt bist．Similarly AV renders Jon．3，9：Who can tell if God will turn and repent instead of Who can tell whether God will not turn and repent．If we substitute but for $\mathbf{N}$ ，we need not insert the negative．

[^17] phrase would mean：Perhaps thou hast not been made Queen just for a contingency like the present．This statement would be possible only if E had not become Queen．If the King had given orders to kill the Queen，the father of one of the maidens who were not made Queen， might have said to his daughter：－－פ ．The negative in our Who knows whether thou hast not been made Queen just for such an emergency is on a par with our not in phrases like Won＇t you come？which is quite different from Will you （really）not come？The particles $\times$ 上 or（B）could not be used in this connection．B＇s interpretation（which has been adopted by Reuss）Who knows（what may happen）when thou hast come to the royal throne at that time or when thou hast appeared before the King＇s majesty at that time（Ger．Und wer weiss wenn du um diese Zeit hinge－ kommen sein wirst zum königlichen Thron）is impossible．This would
 Mיח Miv could not be omitted，and only if a time had been specified；e．$g$ ．if $\mathbf{E}$ had been urged to go to the King at a certain time，then some friend，wishing to dissuade her，might say，If I were you，I would not go；who knows what will happen when thou goest to the King at that time．It is true that this phrase might also anticipate a favorable outcome；Naomi might have added to her instructions in Ruth 3，3：תコニ ジベ

（16）ffl＂y means for me（3 pro me；see conclusion of n．on＂コニท）


In（and the conjunction 9 means with；in Arabic， ，in such cases is construed with the accusative（WdG 2，325，D；JAOS

$f(7)$ ，thus means，not for the same period，i．e．for three days（B） but in the same（strict）manner，viz．day and night．Fasting was observed，as a rule，from sunrise to sunset，food and drink being taken each day after sundown，just as in the Mohammedan fast of Ramadan （رمضا）．

 the $\beth$ essentio，as B and Wd suppose；cf．n．on 7，3）．This statement expresses E＇s confidence in God＇s help．After having fasted for three days，both day and night，she could not be very attractive to the King， unless God wrought a miracle as in the case of Daniel and his friends （Dan．1，15）．The fasting in the present case is not a sign of mourning，
but humiliation before Jнгн in order to secure His help; cf. $2 \mathrm{~S} 12,22$; 1 K 21, 27; Jon. 3, 5. Post-Biblical תֶּת, humbling, means fast; cf.



It is not necessary to suppose that the verb TニN in the phrase
 banished (see n. on $\boldsymbol{\square T H} \mathbf{N}, 3,13$ ). E risks her life, just as Sheherazade and the Herodotean prototype of both, Фaiðvpin (Pur. 8, 38). 3 tradensque me morti et periculo.
 fast for the $13^{\text {th }}$ and $14^{\text {th }}$ of Nisan (so J. D. Michaelis) but he went over (so C 162) to the City to call the Jews of Susa together and to urge them to fast for three days in order to crave Jevr's blessing on E and her hazardous undertaking in behalf of her brethren. The City, in which M's brethren lived, was separated from the Acropolis (cf. n. on 1, 2) by the Choaspes, Assyr. Uknû (JHUC, No. 114, p. 111 ${ }^{\text {b }}$; cf. JAOS 18, 145, n. 1).

## -

(1) It is perhaps not necessary to insert (with $B, R, W d$ ) שา before


 abstract תוֹלק may mean regalia. Milton uses royalty for emblems of royalty (Assyr. simat šarrûti). LB zog sich königlich an; so, too, C 163. S translates: $d a \operatorname{zog} E$ das Königs'gewand' an; but in his
 $c f$. nn. on v. 8 and 4, 7.
fit 719 does not mean she stepped in, entered (S) or she stood (so $\mathrm{AV}=\mathfrak{3}$ stetit) but she waited; cf. 6, 5; 7, 7 and our stay $=$ Lat. store,
 come to a stand, stop, wait, remain. Shakespeare says: a servant that stays upon me; cf.
 םיד; ; cf. Ger. stauen).
ff
 throne was opposite the entrance, so that the King, seated on his throne, could see who was waiting in the forecourt.
(2) fit



## 



The rendering of ש
(3) The thy request, even (if it should be) half the kingdom, it shall be granted
 or





 Waw apodosis; so, too, LB auch die Hälfte des Königthums soll dir gegeben werden and AV it shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom.
 see $n$. on "
(5) The view (AoF 3,36) that 5,5-8 is merely an erroneous repetition of $\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{1}$ is gratuitous.

(7) The : at the end of this verse corresponds to our - . There should be a dash, not a colon in K's Textbibel; also the Athnah in ת בּק (v. 8) is equivalent to a dash. E starts to tell the King what her petition and request is. She begins: My petition and requestthen she hesitates and decides to wait another day; she therefore invites the King to dine with her a second time when she will answer his question (so, correctly, B and Wd). The idea, that it would be better to wait another day, comes to her while she adds the humble qualification: if the King is kindly disposed toward me, and if it seem proper to the King to grant my petition and to accede to my request.
(8) The last clause of v. 8, , the explanation given above is the correct interpretation of vv. 7. 8. If this last clause were omitted, we might interpret: My request is ( $=$ all I ask is simply) that the King dine with me again. S supplies in his translation after my request: - besteht darin, following 3 petitio mea et preces sunt istae (just as LB and AV supply is at the end of v. 7) but in the nn . he gives the correct explanation; $c f . \mathrm{n}$. on 4, 7 .
ff
contraction of remnant of $\begin{gathered}\text {, } \\ \text {, day, just as the final } \square \text { in } \\ \text {, the day before }\end{gathered}$ yesterday, lit. the third day; cf, the remarks on KTRK. : in nn. on 4, 14.

 For the long a cf. $; \therefore=; \angle 2$ day, subsequent day, following day; contrast Fürst's dictionary
 pound of $\Omega$ תר กnn
 and $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 80, \mathrm{~g}$.
(9) In 7 サx ィ ו



 (S). $\mathfrak{3}$ sed nec motum quidem de loco sessionis suae; LB noch sich vor ihm bewegte; AV nor moved for him. In $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ we find the correction:


 form $\mathbf{Z} \omega \sigma$ d́ $\rho a$ is probably influenced by the Greek name $\mathbf{Z} \omega \sigma \dot{\sim} \dot{\rho} \rho \circ v$. Josephus reads Zapara (with variants). Jensen conjectured that $w T{ }^{T}$ was a corruption of $=$ Qiri(ri)ša, the name of an Elamite goddess; cf.

 ( $c f$. ibid. b, $\beta$ ). Jensen is now inclined to identify wnf with the Babyl. goddess of wine, Sirešu (see Genesis 81,34 ; Pur. 30, 34; 31, 25) just as he accepts Graetz's (or rather J. D. Michaelis') combination of פand פרוח (see Pur. 50, 2; cf. n. on 3,7) but his former explana-
 Nาเม ; for " that is a mutilated form of זרש ; cf. Ch's explanation of $(1,9)$.
(11) Hitzig's conjecture ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$, die Fülle seines Ansehns (cf. ( x ) $=$ his great distinction (endorsed by B) is just as gratuitous (contrast


[^18] he had advanced him（B：alles das womit ihn der König gross gemacht）


 S＇s explanation，all with regard to which the King had advanced him （LB Alles wie ihn der König so gross gemacht hatte；AV all the things wherein the King had promoted him）is not natural；cf．the remarks on


 אכּ et servos suos．In $\mathbb{Z}$（园 appears before 7 コy，where it is less appropriate．
（12）ff min（ vited by her（so Wd）not to her（LB，AV，S）＝飞 ールーヴ
（13）ff ever（B）． $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {vL }}$ örav，but $\mathfrak{3}$ quamdiu．ffin is construct state before the relative clause；cf．
（14）䟣
 3 et jussit excelsam parari crucem（LB und liess einen Baum zurichten， AV，caused the gallows to be made）are free renderings．It is not
 ย̇пi súdov for
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 more original．The omission of the name of God in the present passage is not designed，as $W d$ supposes；contrast $n$ ．on $\boldsymbol{\square} \boldsymbol{\sim}$ The personification of sleep（ $A V^{\mathbb{M}}$ the King＇s sleep fled）is quite natural． Den König floh der Schlaf（but not des König＇s Schlaf floh）is idiomatic German；cf．our phrase the color fled from her cheeks．In Gen．31， 40 LB has for ות（3 fugiebatque somnus ab oculis meis， AV my sleep departed from mine eyes）：und kam kein Schlaf in meine Augen；but in the present passage LB has the prosaic translation konnte der König nicht schlafen；so，too，AV； 3 noctem illam duxit rex insomnem．
 original．© $\tau \hat{̣} \delta \iota \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \omega ̣$ av̉rov̂（cf．Pur．7，21）is just as secondary as the

 the end of $v .5$ ．
 2,23 and 10,$2 ; c f . n$ ．on $\mathbf{8}, 14$ and the remarks on the gloss च1玉，Nah． 31.
（2）Similarly text of 2，21．$C f$ ．the scribal expansions in 2，3．8．
 ing on -12 （ 3 quid，pro hac fide，honoris ac praemii $M$ consecutus est）． In the same way we find in the cuneiform account of the Deluge， 1.174 ： â＇ú－ma ûçî napišti，what soul has escaped？cf．Arab．ل ${ }^{\prime}$ áiiu rájulin，what man？（WdG 2，220）．Consequently we must read the ideograms at the end of 11.82 .83 ，and 68 of the Flood tablet as geni－ tives（not accusatives，HW 556 ${ }^{\text {；}}$ ；nor nominatives，KB6，234）viz．míma íšu eçênši xurâçi，i．e．I loaded her（the ship）with all the silver I had，I loaded her with all the gold I had；lit．（with）whatever I had I loaded her of gold；eçênši＝açênši from çênu＝戸゙氵．Heb．₹u （Gen．45，17）is an Aramaism；cf． The passages in Gen． $\mathbf{4 0} .45$ belong to the Ephraimitic Document． $\mathbf{A G}^{2}$ ， 303 translates eçênši：I filled it；for the epenthesis of the ê in eçênši see my Assyr．E－vowel，p．28；cf． $\mathrm{AG}^{2}, 266.94$ ．In the same way we must read in 1.68 of the Flood tablet：III šar çâbe nâš sussulša içábilû šamni，i．e．three oápol of（sesame－）oil（see Pur．30，39）carry her stevedores（lit．каиךфó $\rho o \iota$, basket－bearers；cf．also Delitzsch，Mehr Licht，p．39）．
 to haplography；see Ezra 30，27；Kings 245，35；ZDMG 61，289， 40.
 eth）see n ．on 5,1 ．
（6）For ney
ff＂גar than on me（B mehr Ehre als mir；also Wd mehr als，AV more than to myself）but to confer honor except on me（ $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{TL}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ ， 3 nullum alium nisi；LB wem anders denn mir， K ausser） S translates ausser． mir，but in his nn．he says，＂חּ means mehr als ich；cf．n．on
 $m e$ ，beside me，in addition to me．Nor does in mean more than in Ecclesiastes，as Wd states．In Eccl．2， 15 means exceedingly， extremely，very；in 7， 11 it means exceeding：superior，better；in 7，16： exceeding，orer，too；in 12，9：beyond，in addition to；in 12，12：besides （see Eccl．）．
（7）The prefixed nominative absolute，at the end of this verse，ブニ゙
 $\mathbf{H}$ ，as Wd supposes；this construction is by no means abrupt（B）in Semitic；cf． $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 143, \mathrm{c}$ ，footnote；WdG 2，256； $\mathrm{SG}^{2}, \S 317$ ；Dillmann， Ethiop．gr．${ }^{2}$ ，p． 446 （Eng．translation，p．505）．
（8）For the phrase
 $(5,11)$ ．
 tertiary scribal expansion，derived（ $c f . \mathbf{n}$ ．on $\mathbf{8}, \mathbf{1 4}$ ）from the secondary
 If we omit honored（just as the Maccabean prototype of M，Jonathan，was honored by King Alexander Balas；see 1 M 10，20．61；Pur．6，35；cf．also third
 whose head（referring to the horse）a golden crown has been placed（so
 suffix refers to the horse，the clause being coordinated to the preceding
 $\mathfrak{3}, \mathrm{LB}$ ，and AV，however，do not refer the suffix to the horse： $\mathfrak{3}$ et（homo debet）accipere regium diadema super caput suum，LB（den Mann ．．．． soll man herbringen）dass man die königliche Krone auf sein Haupt setze，AV and the crown royal which is set upon his（scil．the King＇s） head（this would require transposition of
 תリゴン ニ




 Nif＇al，not impf．Qal（Maurer）for（see Judges 57，42）．Nor is it necessary to read $1 \times \boldsymbol{\beta}$
 $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ a hand of the $7^{\text {th }}$ cent．has added in the margin（after the clause


（9）It is better to read，with 0 ，for



$\tau \omega \sigma a \nu$ ．．．．кทрvбのє́ $\omega \omega \sigma a \nu$ are secondary）．The incorrect plural forms M believed that M did not merely superintend these functions，but that he performed them himself；$c f$ ．especially $\mathbb{C}^{2}(260,23)$ ．The statement at the end of c． 5, ，אשים（cf．also in $7,9.10$ ）is somewhat different．
 not the place before the royal palace（Schultz，B，Wd）．M was led on horseback through the City，not through the Acropolis；cf．last n．on c． 3. This forum may have been before the Acropolis which contained the royal palace，but not immediately before the royal palace．
 n．on 2,19 ．

The question raised by J．D．Michaelis，Had the King forgotten that all the Jews were doomed to destruction？is easily answered．The King might have honored M，even if all the Jews were to be massacred in a few months；a soldier（or sailor）may be decorated before he is put to death．But the King had probably decided to discard H and his sanguinary policy，as soon as he learned from the official records that M had saved his life，not H．The order to honor M，which he gives to H， is the first instalment of the punishment he intends to mete out to H （cf．n．on 7，7）．Nor is it reasonable to ask，How did the King know that M was a Jew at the King＇s Gate？This was probably stated in the records；if not，the attendants of the King could easily supply this infor－ mation，just as Harbonah told the King that H had put up a stake for M．If the King asked，Who is this $M$ ？some one was no doubt present who could answer：He is a Jew（who has a stand）at the King＇s Gáte． But M may have been a familiar figure in Susa，so that he was known to the King．$C f$ ． nn ．on $2,10.11 ; 3,14$ ．＊
 ounc on， 3 operto capite）is corrected in $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ to катакєкадvцнє́vos
 but mg ，is destitute of all probability．

 for N\％ーהリมp（Cant．73，ad Cant．3，2；Proverbs 67，41）also Arab．
 la＇īámma，with great difficulty；فـاما الناس

[^19]fa＇ámmâ＇n－nâsu－mâ＊ḥâšâ Quraịšan（WdG 2，224，D；276，B；

 cf．VG 70，below；94，1．4．Contrast ZAT 3，17－31．

We need not suppose that H＇s wife and his friends were familiar with the Scriptural passages concerning the Amalekites（Ex．17．16； 1 S 15，2－7；Gen．32，26，\＆c）．A person who lived in Susa might have seen with his own eyes that it was hard to accomplish anything against a Jew．$C f$ ．the parallels between E and the Book of Nehemiah referred to at the end of nn．on 3， 1 ．



广
 N゙ロיロロ）see n．on 2， 14.
 the $\beth$ essentice（see Numbers 57，46）as Wd supposes；nor have we the
 （so AV）just as ニーナー（1，12）means at the command．This is a variety of the ב instrumenti；ב in this connection means through the force of； cf．our in or by virtue of and by order \＆c． $\mathfrak{G}^{v} \delta o \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \dot{\eta} \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ air $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \mu a \tau i$ $\mu o v ;$ 3，freely，dona mihi animam pro qua rogo．
（4） $\mathfrak{f \in t}$（so，too， $\mathcal{Z}$ ）is Aramaic；cf．the last but one paragraph of nn ．on 1,8 ．
 while to annoy the King on account of the enemy（so，too，Reuss）．－ The sense is correctly given by B $(431,13)$ ：der Feind ist nicht werth， dass ich seinetwegen den König verletze oder betribe，except that ver－ letze or betrübe is not the proper word；it should be belästige，behellige （see below）．The literal translation would be：The enemy is not equica－ lent to the annoyance of the King．The ב in アTコニ is the ב pretii： the enemy is no equivalent at the cost of the annoyance of the King；cf．
 foundation thereof at the cost of（AV in）his first－born，and at the cost of（ AV in）his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it；i．e．The laying of the foundation shall cost him his first－born，the setting up of

[^20]the gates shall cost him his youngest son（see the translation of this passage in the Polychrome Bible and cf．abore，n．on 4．7）．To annoy the King would be too high a price for the punishment of this enemy； the enemy is so utterly worthless that it would be a pity to gire the King the slightest annorance on his account．This statement implies the greatest respect and consideration for the King，and the utmost con－

 but also annoyance； and Heb．Tip Deut．29，19；Ezek．5，13；$\psi 79,5)$ ．
 corresponds to Arab．© náziqa，to be easily angered and easily
 a swell of sudden anger，a fit of disappointment or anger，a huff．Also Assyr．nazâqu（impf．izziq）means to disturb，trouble，harass． Barth＇s combination of קï：with veỉ náqqaça，to injure is mrong （cf．BA 3，81）．
 should hare no damage，but that the King should not be annoyed． troubled（with the administrative details of the goverument）．© renders
 LB und der König der Mühe überhoben wäre．Behrmann＇s render－ ing，ne quis rex detrimenti capiat，which is endorsed by Marti，is incorrect．ミ translates：$م$ مsis if hase，that they（the sa－
 harm，but also to annoy，molest，irritate．

In Ezr．4， 13 קign ニ゙ニ゙ン means：she（Jerusalem）will give the great King（cf．ZDMG 61．289．17；Nah．30，below）trouble．Jerusalem cannot injure the great King，but the city may give him trouble．The
 endamage the revenue of the Kings（AV）．© has here кai тoîto ßaoulits какотони．3 et usque ad reges haec noxa perveniet．$\$ 10$ pals an els『，2，LB und ihr Vormehmen wird den Königen Schaden bringen；but
 next paragraph）．
 troublesome for the great King（ $\delta \mu$ éjas $\beta a \sigma \omega$ eis）and the provinces（the
 annoyance）of the great King（not to the hurt of the kings；so AT）． ff ロnex in Ezra 4． 13 is certainly not a noun meaning revenue，but an adrerb with the meaning eventually，finally，ultimately． $\mathfrak{G}^{\top}$ has in Ezra

4，15：какотоюи̂әa ßaбілєîs каì $\chi$＇́pas（so，too，${ }^{\text {L }} 1$ Esdr．4，15；but Ezra





In the present passage $\mathcal{G}^{v}$ renders


 have understood it without the help of the witch of En－dor（ $c f$ ．n．on 8，1）． $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ a $\mathfrak{v} \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ is also supposed to be a corruption of $\dot{o} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ，but it is difficult to see how ópyŋ̂s should have been corrupted to $a \dot{v} \lambda \hat{\eta} s ; c f$ ．the remarks on the emendation $\kappa \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$ for $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ in nn ．on 3，7．C 197 thinks that $\alpha$ v̉ $\lambda \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ represents a Grecized form of $\boldsymbol{N}$ ，injustice．The original reading may have been the abbreviated genitive of ${ }^{\circ} \chi \lambda \eta \sigma t s$ ，trouble，
 $\lambda a \iota ~ i v a \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda v \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ тòv кúpoóv $\mu 0 v$ gives the sense of the passage correctly， but freely． 3 nunc autem hostis noster est cujus crudelitas redundat in regem（i．e．whose extreme cruelty will reflect on the King）is a mere guess．LB so würde der Feind dem Könige doch nicht schaden is entirely wrong；nor is the rendering in K＇s Textbibel any better：da aber der König geschädigt werden soll，so verdient der Widersacher
 participle tieems to be a corruption，not of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}^{\circ}$ ，as $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}$ suggest，but

 suppose no different text．© NPッグN seems to be a transposition of


稞 enemy is not worthy of troubling the King，i．e．the enemy is so con－ temptible that it is not worth while to trouble the King on his account． All the emendations proposed are unnecessary．Oettli＇s conjecture，
 worth the damage of the King（endorsed by Wd）is gratuitous and illogical．Nor can we accept O＇s emendation ה ה ה M （S：solches Bedrängniss wäre nicht hinreichend den König zu betrü－ ben）．GB ${ }^{14}$ ，s．v．Tenders：Der Feind rerdient nicht，dass der König verletzt wird；this should be dass der König（seinetwegen） behelligt wird．

The rendering of AV，although the enemy could not countervail the King＇s damage，has recently been defended by W who says（W 18）that
the meaning of our passage is，$H$ would not be able to reimburse the King for the damage（loss of taxes \＆c）he would suffer，if he permitted H to exterminate the Jews．W 24 calls attention to the fact that there were a great many Jerrish publicans in Egypt，and that the King （Euergetes II）would have suffered great loss，if the Jewish farmers of the revenues had been exterminated together with their coreligionists． But if the property of the Jews had been confiscated，the King would have received，not only all the taxes collected by the Jewish publicans （including their commission）but also their accumulated wealth；see also Pur．28， 15.
 ¿ ßaбileús Tís ovitos кт入．
ft אn

 the first clause，אาก emphasizes the interrogative pronoun；in the second，NTT is the subject and quite appropriate according to GK ${ }^{27}$ ， § 136，b；Tr＂means here where？not which（Eccl．11，6）．The demonstrative $\pi$ emphasizes the interrogative $n$ in the second clause （contrast $\mathrm{GB}^{14}, 24$ ，below）just as $\boldsymbol{N}^{1} \boldsymbol{T}$ emphasizes ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{g}$ in the first clause （see Nah．47，ad v．12）．For＂ $\mathbf{N}$ ，where？cf．Is．50，1；66，1；Job 28， 12．20；38，19 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ．Heb．is where？Ruth 2， 19 （＝Assyr．ânu，Arab． أين aina；see Kings 203，9）is merely＂$N$ with the interrogative particle 3．：which we have also in mannu，who？（see n．on 1，12）． $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{VL}}$ omit


fit not welchen sein Herz erfüllt hat（Wd）nor der sein Herz damit erfüllt hat（S）nor dessen Herz ihn erfüllt hat（B）．Cff．the remarks on the common mistranslation of שטּ （with J）read לֹּ
 ーツニン ；cf．the Pharisaic gloss Eccl．8， 11 and Acts 5， 3 where Peter
 $\pi v \in \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{\tau ò}$ ä $\gamma$ lov．A man must fill his heart（i．e．his mind）with barefaced audacity in order to undertake such a renture；he must gather up courage in his heart．
 and enemy is this wicked $H$ ，so AV；LB der Feind und Widersacher ist dieser böse Haman（similarly S and K ）．This would require the

 a corrector has prefixed émißovдos каi to éx $\theta$ คós． 3 hostis est inimicus
noster pessimus iste est Aman，inserting noster；$\$$ Lna，ino i， 0 In
 B＇s ein Drangsal übender und feindseliger．Mann ist dieser böse $H$ da is very awkward．The first clause，ニット answer to the King＇s question $\pi$ Ninne and the second clause，而 King asks，Who is it？and where is he？E replies：A man，an adver－ sary and an enemy：H，the evil one，there！In L＇s edition（but not in
 ovitos．C xx translates：Ein Widersacher und Feind ist es；H ist dieser Bösewicht，but C 198 explains：Jener Übelthäter und Feind ist H，dieser Bösewicht．

E had invited H to the banquet in order to be able to give the King this answer．If she had accused $H$ in his absence，the grand vizier would hare had a better chance to defend himself（cf．C 168）．Here he was confronted with the Queen，and he collapsed，not because he had tried to exterminate all the Jews，but because he knew the King was aware of the fact that M，not H，had saved the King＇s life，and that H＇s hatred against $M$ and the Jews was chiefly due to his apprehension lest the trick to which he owed his sudden eleration might become known to the King（ $c f$ ．n．on 3，4）．The situation was all the more desperate after the Queen had told the King that she was a Jewess and the foster－ daughter of M who had saved the life of the King．
ft กyュg means he was surprised，taken by surprise，overtaken（Ger． uiberrumpelt）not he was afraid（so AV）．Arab．بغت means to happen unexpectedly，to come or fall upon a person suddenly and unexpectedly



 cf．the last paragraph of nn ．on $\mathbf{4}, 4$ ．W＇s conception of this passage is entirely wrong．It is perfectly natural that the King leaves the room and goes to the garden．In the first place，he was rery much incensed and did not like to give vent to his anger in the presence of the Queen； many a man who is enraged will get up and leave the room rather than speak out in the presence of his wife．Moreorer，the King wanted to have time to think the situation orer．$H$ was grand rizier and had no doubt a number of powerful adherents；so he could not be disposed of without due consideration．B states that the King went to the park um in der freien Luft die erste Hitze des Zorns verrauchen zu lassen und $z u$ überlegen，welche Strafe über $H z u$ verhängen sei．The King＇s suspicion had been aroused as soon as he learned from the official records that M，not H，had discovered the conspiracy（ $c f . \mathrm{n}$ ．on 6，10）．The
statement that the King left the room and went to the garden, is not a grober und geradezu unerklärlicher Compositionsfehler (W 18; contrast C 181, below). In a dramatic performance (see Pur. 38, 31; 12, 1) the audience would wait in breathless expectation for the reappearance of the King. When the King returned, he knew, of course, that H had no idea of assaulting the Queen; his remark, Is he going to assault the Queen while I am at home? is a cruel jest (C 200 calls it tödtende Ironie). It showed how the King was disposed toward H (C 200 says: In diesen furchtbar ironischen Worten lag H's Todesurtheil).

For 7 ² , remained (not stood up, AV; 3 surrexit; \& se) see n. on 5,1 .
 א ארום א
(8) The pointing jojplies that $\mathbf{H}$ threw himself at the feet of $\mathbf{E}$ (cf. 8, 3) when the King returned. The translation had thrown himself (AV was fallen, S war niedergefallen, K war niedergesunken, 3 reperit Aman super lectulum corruisse) would require the pointing ; for the pluperfect $c f$. n. on 1, 9. The participle is more dramatic. Also ユข is participle, not perfect.



 qáqqara núššiqû (AJSL 19, 134; ZDMG 58, 630, n. 36). See e. g. KB 1, 28, 28; 32, 37: šepê'a içbatô-ma arîmšunûti, they clasped my feet, and I pardoned them; KB 2, 178, 19: unaššiq šepê'a rêmu aršišu-ma, he kissed my feet, and I granted him mercy. If $\mathbf{E}$ was recumbent on a dining couch, H had to bow down על עלחה , if he wanted to clasp, or kiss, the feet of the Queen. A man may kiss the hem of the garment of a lady to show his humble devotion to her; but her husband may misinterpret it. S's rendering vor dem Diwan is inaccurate. If $H$ had fallen down before the couch, the King could not have made his cruel jest. Heb. לy cannot mean before; it might mean close to, hard by; cf. $\mathrm{GB}^{14} 534^{\mathrm{b}}, 3$, c. This is different from | y |
| :---: |
| y | (cf. our phrase to sit over a meal) \&c (Kings 134, 27). If a man sits very close to a lady in a crowded car, he sits almost upon her. $\$$ has in

 convivalis (Talmud. בơㅇ) see BL 68.



 n．on v．7；ai corresponds to the Ger．etwa gar（so，correctly，S）cf．etiam （Cic．Tusc．2，7，17）and ENT Job 40，8；Gen．18，13．23；Am．2， 11.
ff ジルコン is not inf．with the prefixed preposition $\}$ ，but impf．with prefixed emphatic ל；see Proverbs 52，11；AJSL 22，201，1．18；contrast GK $^{27}, \S 114$ ，i，note 1 ；see also my paper on the scriptio plena of emphatic la－（ $\mathbf{N}$ ）in OLZ 10，305，and the remarks on Hag．1， 9 in nn．on 3， 7.

W 18 remarks，the King does not say the Queen，which would be more correct and more impressive，he says：soll denn dem Weibe in meinem Hause Gewalt angethan werden？It is true that $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{VL}}$ have tìv
 has $\dot{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha$ in 1,19 where the omission of this title in $f(f t i s i n t e n-$ tional．
fit 9 ニーク refers，of course，to the cruel jest of the King（see con－ clusion of first n．on v．7）not to a special command to execute H，as B supposes；the order to put the grand vizier to death is given at the end of $v .9$ in the words תלוּ

For 1 （ 3 statim operuerunt faciem ejus）read，with Condamin （Revue biblique，7，2，258－261，cited by S）and Perles（Analekten，

 ＝גָּרָּ

 but in his nn．he says：Owing to the reference to 6,12 ，the reading of the received text is preferable：there M（sic！）was a びN＂ H＇s head is covered．S adds：$C f$ ．for the game of dice，that took place between $H$ and M，3，7，9，24－26．－If S had been able to carry his own notes through the press，he would probably have suppressed these remarks；$c f$ ．n．on 4， 7.
（9）For suggested the impalement of Haman was not กลィニาก，but Bouradav＝ Tתב who had been impaled according to 2，23；see n．on 2， 22 ．
ff חin az does not mean Huc accedit quod（S）．It implies an ellipsis，just as the in in（Ruth 2，21）I might also state that，or
 a propos；cf．also ーボニージ $\mathbf{- N}$ in 5，12．Harbonah thinks H is a
 worthy of impalement，behold！there is also（ذ）the pole which H set up for M．＊If we render this by Why，we have again an ellipsis： Why，there is the pole means originally：Why don＇t you impale him？ There is the stake \＆c．

[^21]fat אשר（cf． 1 S 25，30；Jer．32，42）could mean only who made kind remarks about the King，（AV who has spoken good for the King，LB der Gutes für den König geredet hat）but not who did the King a good turn or who rendered the King a great service （S der doch für des Königs Heil gesorgt hatte）．We must point $\underset{\uparrow}{ }$



 ד ד א א N゙コלロ

The stem means to complete，to mature，to wean，to do；it may mean to do good or to do evil（cf． 1 S 24，18）but，as a rule，it means，in Hebrew，to do good；cf．$\psi \psi 13,6 ; 116,7 ; 119,17$ ．Arab．جهبل ja－ mila means a good deed，a favor，benefit．In Assyrian，on the other hand，tûru gimilli，to return a deed（HW 198 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ）means，as a rule，to return an evil deed，to retaliate．Our verb to retaliate means now especially to retaliate injuries，but formerly one could say also to re－ taliate favors；to retaliate a visit meant to return a call，to repay a visit．Similarly to requite may mean to recompense，to reward or to

 OLZ 10，306）．
 partial assimilation of the initial $\boldsymbol{y}$ to the sonant nasal（cf．Nah．31，
 and Nah．26，below；45，below．$\dagger$ The original root is（Nah．35， below）．Cf．also Assyr．kamâlu，to be revengeful，to resent，be indig－
 retaliate was formerly used in the sense of to repay or return a favor \＆c，so the verb to resent could formerly be used in a good sense $=$ to receive with satisfaction．

## $\pi$

（1）J thinks that men must be a secondary correction for 4） naive！Contrast 2， 3 （Пทาュ）and last paragraph of nn．on 2，7；cf． also J＇s restoration of
 an explanation of $\operatorname{mb}$ NTM，just as $\mathbf{3}$ quod esset patruus suus．

[^22]The meaning of the Septuagintal phrase is that $\mathbf{E}$ had been taken into M＇s house and adopted by him；оiкєios means a member of the family；
 follow fft；lor is due to a misunderstanding，but it does not seriously affect the sense．
 atory gloss to the preceding ロッּחּ tion 9,$25 ; c f$ ．nn．on $\begin{gathered}\text { ．5．For the prefixed Waw explicative see the }\end{gathered}$ remarks on אภ：İา $(1,10)$ and n．on 1,17 ；$c f$ ．also n．on 8，6．For scribal expansions derived from parallel passages see n ．on v .14.


 imply that E takes a personal interest in the matter（as S supposes）but it is a coquettish climax，equivalent to our if you really care for me a little．
 Hal）is a scribal expansion interrupting the connection between $\Omega$
 is derived from the end of v .3 ．
（6）The first clause of this verse seems to be a gloss（or variant；cf．

 How shall I be able and（how shall I）see．For the perf．＂ת＂אา after the preceding impf．Nee $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 112$ ，p．

The idea（AoF 3，3，below）that the final ；in $\boldsymbol{T ⿰ ⿺ 乚 一 匕}$ sian influence is just as fanciful as the explanation of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{n}=\text { • ；；see conclu－}}$ sion of nn ．on 1,5 ．The constr．of $\boldsymbol{T}$ ．



 original．The King did not give the order：（7， 9 ）because H had planned to exterminate all the Jews in the Persian empire；this plan had been sanctioned by the King．$H$ was impaled because he had deceived the King（ $c f$ ．second n．on 6，10）．The alleged assault on the
 Qיחּחיחּ is derived from 9， 25 just as the scribal expansions in vv． 3 and 5.
（8）fft ybuncin（so，too，\＄）means，of course，concerning the


S in Betreff der Juden．Wd says，על may mean in Betreff der Juden or an die Juden；he thinks this equivocal phrase is inten－ tional inasmuch as the letters were sent both to the satraps concerning the Jews and to the Jews themselves．But this view is erroneous；cf． third paragraph of nn．on v． 9.

 fers $\mathfrak{G}$ ．
 reads


 to be just as irrevocable as the letters sent by H ．
fitan is not possible in a coordinated relative clause（J）．Read פּm as in 3，12．If an were correct，we might feel tempted to read it 1， 180 that نeغعول for was originally a Nif＇al form，the initial $m$ being due to the analogy of the participles of the other derived con－ jugations．
（9）V． 9 containing 43 words（ 192 letters）is the longest verse in the ローロィァ，longer even than its anti－Jewish pendant in 3， 12.
fat on o Babyl．Simânu（stem gwn）．For $9=m$ see Pur．23，19； 32,$24 ; c f$ ．n．on 1，9．Simânu，appointed time，season has passed into Heb．as with partial assimilation of the initial o to the sonant
 31，below）．In Syriac the $v=m$ is expressed by $\overline{\mathrm{Z}}$ ： $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\circ}$（modern Syriac zônâ）．For the third month，i．e．Sivan（3 Siban） $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathbb{V}}$ has the first month，i．e．Nisan．In the margin of $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ this has been corrected in

 and lion for with the cuneiform name of a star（Procyon？）xabaçirânu（HW 268a）． The intervocalic $b$ became $v$（ZA 19，235；contrast $\mathrm{AG}^{2}, \S 57$ ，a）and this



 following $\mathcal{Z}$ ，＇凸，דל，as in the preceding verse；cf．nn．on 7， 7 （עלין for My（y ）and 1，17．This must be connected with the preceding
clause＂ת the
 The instructions were，of course，sent to the Persian officials，not to the
 after $\boldsymbol{3}$ had been miswritten $\boldsymbol{\text { K }}$ ．The prefixed 9 is omitted in $\$$ ；on



The proclamation was to be made known to all the peoples（うこう ［＂ジ）in the Persian empire；in this way the Jews learned of it，so that they could organize armed resistance to defend their lives and protect their property．M learned what had happened，when H＇s decree was published in Susa $(4,1)$ although $H$ had，of course，sent no special mes－ sage to M．Contrast
 verse，is due to the misreading ${ }^{\text {g }}$ ，instead of＇The Jews have always adopted the language of the country in which they settled；the Persian Jews understood Persian，just as the Alexandrian Jews spoke Greek；it was not necessary to write to them in Heb．or Aramaic；cf．n．on last clause of c． 1.
（10）The verbal forms בחּפ゙ף，




For
ff arcio is an explanatory gloss to the following พอาส＂コรา。 Another glossator has added the Pers．term a＂ח





 gloss ロックาロコ，and substitutes for the antiquarian gloss，giving the Pers．name of the royal horses，a Pers．word for the couriers ：－－ 0 （ explicative in oo cf．n．on 1，17．LB reitende Boten auf jungen Maulthieren，AV posts on horseback，and riders on mules，camels and young dromedaries．According to Ed．Meyer，Geschichte des Alter－ thums，3， 67 both בני not to their horses；but this is erroneous．J considers בּם בּם a ridiculous combination；but modern couriers often travel on horseback
（or in automobiles）although courier means originally runner．We also have now mounted infantry．
ff edaries；but Herod．5，14；8， 98 favor the meaning race－horse；see
 not good；no scribe would have corrupted コゴ into ய゙ゴ ；cf．remarks
 means originally mount＝animal for riding；cf．Assyr．rukûšu（see Ezra 57，38）whereas Syr． ．means originally property and then
 corrupt；it cannot mean bind the chariot to the swift beast；but the meaning of the passage may be：Abandon the chariot for the racer，i．e． try to get away as quickly as possible，not in a chariot，but on the back of a swift horse．fit an may be a corruption of＂ּׁา，although
 as Marti supposes）．\＆

 （Ex．23，11）．
ff arynunn is derived from Old Pers．khšatra，dominium；so it means dominicus．Instead of （cf．n．on 3，12）．This was the name of the horses kept for the personal
 （saddle horses and teams）kept by a landed proprietor for his personal use are often called in Germany Herrschaftspferde（i．e．seigneurial or manorial horses）in distinction from the Wirthschaftspferde，i．e．the farm－horses，work－horses，\＆c．B $(436,3)$ correctly states：Wir müssen wohl an herrschaftliche Pferde denken，welche in königlichen Gestüten
 （naked）seems to be a corruption of ベンコยาホ，courier，and む ベンニコา

 and Kings 84，3；see also last n．on 4， 4.

For人 studs，i．e．bred in the royal studs for the special use of the King．In Syriac， seems to denote a cross between a jackass and a mare，i．e．a mule；instead

[^23]of 7 꾼 ¿U, rámaka denote a blood-horse, bred in a stud; in fact, it means an inferior mare. But such changes of meaning are not uncommon; the word mare means in German (Mähre) a mean or poor horse, a jade; Wajîn means in classical Arabic of low origin, a mean or poor horse, but in modern Arabic it is used for fast dromedary. The etymological equivalent of knave in German, Knappe, means squire of a knight, while in modern English, knare is used for rogue. J's objections against the interpretation sons of the studs are gratuitous. Cf. Fleischer in Levy's Talmudic dictionary, 4, 487. The stem 7127 may be
 noble and our well-bred. The primitive meaning is dug=tilled, cultivated, cultured; see AJSL 23, 247; cf. conclusion of preceding note.
(11) The clause (AV, incorrectly wherein; so, too, C 217) H; S wodurch) the King had given (permission) to the Jews (cf. ;-9, 9, 13, and Kings, 113, 7) not which he had given to the Jews, referring to the horses. S's statement that the King presented those horses to the Jews is unwarranted.
fft bipni does not mean to assemble, but to organize themselves, to take concerted action. $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ interprets this to mean $\chi \rho \eta \hat{\eta} \sigma$ ai toîs vó $\mu o$ s

 that they should assemble on the day of the massacre planned by H , but that they should assemble in advance to organize armed resistance for the $13^{\text {th }}$ of Adar. If they had assembled on that day, they would have been unable to protect their property. Cf. n. on 9, 2.
 their lives, lit. to stand up for their lives (see Pur. 34, 1). To make a stand means to take a position of defense and resistance. The heading of $\mathbf{c} .8$ in AV correctly states: Ahasuerus granteth to the Jews to defend themselves: This is much more appropriate than the summary given in LB: Die Juden haben Erlaubniss sich an ihren Feinden zu rächen. The idea of the King is not, that the Jews may attack any one who is supposed to be unfriendly disposed toward the Jews; they only receive permission to resist any attack. The repetition of the terms used in the
 permitted to resort to retaliatory measures: if any one attempts $7=-\boldsymbol{m}$
 Russian Jews had been permitted to organize themselves for selfdefense, the majority of the pogroms (see Pur. 35,11 ) would never




 rendering of ロuפ Nothwehr（i．e．self－defense）＊while the Greek phrase corresponds to the Ger．Selbsthülfe．Selbsthülfe（taking the law into one＇s own hands）may be more aggressive than self－defense．
fft brit is a gloss；S：（alle）Bewaffnete（des Volks und der Satra－ pien）．Cf．also third n．on 9， 16.
 ロニถన．A participle may take a verbal suffix（cf．\＆c， $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 116, \mathrm{f}$ ） but the substantive 7 cannot be construed with $\cap \mathbb{E}$ ．\＄has for
〇חּ is misleading；AV，correctly，that would assault them．

S＇s suggestion，that we should supply after ם is gratuitous；at any rate this addition would be just
 is probably due to his misunderstanding of the clause放 at the beginning of this verse．
 zweifelhaft，da man nicht erwarten wird，dass diese Bedränger von Weibern und Kindern werden angegriffen werden，is due to some uncorrected misunderstanding，just as the remarks referred to in n．on
 $34,5)$ but S＇s remark，von Weibern und Kindern hatte man schwerlich Gefahr für sein Leben zu befürchten is unwarranted：a heathen woman might assault a Jewish woman，a heathen boy might attack a Jewish boy；some heathen children might kill an old Jew \＆c．
 ロッコロール，v．14）．The phrase ip
 other hand， $\mathfrak{G}$ adds $\tau \in \in \kappa \alpha$ in 7，4．In c． 3 these additions are appro－ priate，because all the Jews were to be exterminated，and $H$ had prom－ ised to pay 10,000 talents into the royal treasury．Therefore all the Jews had to be killed，both young and old，women and children；and their property had to be confiscated，otherwise $H$ would not have been able to pay the 10,000 talents．Here，however，the Jews received per－ mission only to organize themselves and to defend their lives（לצ －ש：）by slaying，if necessary，all the people of the provinces who

[^24]
 them harm；they were allowed forcibly to resist a forcible attack upon
 be avenged on them（so AV）but they may repel them．Wd＇s conception that the enemies of the Jews were to be massacred without being able to offer any resistance（die Feinde der Juden sollen wehrlos von diesen umgebracht werden）is unwarranted．B－R 360 （1．13）correctly states， the Jews were granted permission，alle welche ．．．．sie bedrangen，zu tödten．Similarly S says，Den Juden wird durch ein Decret das Recht gegeben，für den 13．Adar Schutzmassregeln gegen ihre Feinde zu treffen；but he makes the gratuitous addition und dieselben mit Weib und Kind auszurotten．Even the received text speaks only of the slay－ ing of their assailants．

Driver（LOT $\left.{ }^{6}, 486\right)$ says：If all these measures were taken in self－ defense，they need no justification；but the terms of the narrative itself make it extremely difficult to think that this was the case．This state－ ment，however，is incorrect，just as the statement that it seems impossible to acquit M of permitting an unprovoked massacre．Nor，continues Driver，can the request in 9,13 be excused．But the gibbeting of H＇s ten sons and the second massacre in Susa may have been necessary in order to prevent further anti－Jewish outbreaks．The personal safety of the Queen and the Grand Vizier made it necessary in Susa to teach the enemies of the Jews a lesson．

 Pur．34，7）but to inflict just punishment（AV to avenge themselves on their enemies）．The verb ap：is used in the Maccabean psalm Nah．1， 2 of God；see Nah．53，i；52，vii（also vi）．Cf．תו־月
 187，21）．Injuries inflicted by the assailants of the Jews are to be avenged，but there is to be no revengeful spirit，no indulgence in resent－ ful and malicious feelings，no unrestrained revenge．This may be too ideal a picture，but this explanation is no doubt in harmony with the
 dation＇ N ת א
 a scribal expansion derived from 3，13；so，too，the following フユロー


 ロ゙ウーニ゙ミり；the passive participle ロ゙ヨ゙ーー means pushed，urged，driven， while ロ゙クロー＝means eager：in 3,13 the couriers carried out the com－
mand of $H$, because they were compelled to obey his orders, even if they
 i. e. they take a personal interest in the matter; cf. n. on 2, 9. For

 таүна каì év इov́roıs) is a scribal expansion derived from 3, 15 (contrast B). $\&$ takes ' וֹת
 S renders: und das Dekret war gegeben in der Königsburg zu Susa, i. e. and the decree (which the couriers were ordered to transmit to the satraps) had been given in the royal castle of Susa (K: the couriers left . . . . as soon as the decree had been given in the castle of Susa;


 n. on 1,6 .





fficisis (omitted in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{vL}}$ ) means she roared, shouted; see Nah. 39, 1. 5. B kreischte (shrieked, screamed with delight). The people of Susa, at least the majority of them, exulted over the downfall of $H$ and the elevation of M ; their boisterous mirth was not due to the edict published in favor of the Jews, as B would have it. J thinks we ought to

 (v. 14). The second verb is an explanatory gloss.

The term אורד, light is especially appropriate inasmuch as M and E were originally gods of light; see Pur. 9,$36 ; 10,32 ; 11,20 ; 22,6 ; 26$, 34; cf. MDOG, No. 33, p. 35, below; also ZDMG 61, 287, 21.

 مro2sis. C's emendation is unnecessary. It is possible that a means Judaizing in the sense of sympathizing with the Jews, favorably disposed toward the Jews; cf. Hellenizers \&c; Arab. تقيس taqaiiasa means to side with Qais (WdG 1, 37). Contrast ( 9,27 )
 contrast last n ．on 3，7．In $\mathfrak{G}^{5}$ a corrector has substituted $\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \rho \epsilon \sigma \kappa \alpha-$ бєка́т $\eta$ ．

For םהּ ב pounai่S－S，depending（contrast $\mathrm{SG}^{2}, \S 249, \mathrm{D}$ ）on the preceding

 scribal expansions．

The pronoun
 turned to the contrary．
（2）ffl


 Heb．phrase is undoubtedly who tried to do them bodily harm \＆ce，not



The clause does not mean no one stood up against them．The enemies of the Jews attacked them，but could not prevail against them．There is a difference between
 ＂עִ $=$＝ so，too，S（Niemand konnte vor ihnen bestehen）but in the introductory remarks prefixed to his nn．on c． 9 he makes the unwarranted statement： Die Judenfeinde werden am dreizehnten des Monats Adar ausgerottet． Vom Schrecken gelähmt wagen sie keinen Widerstand，sondern lassen sich im ganzen Reiche ruhig hinmetzeln（cf．n．on 4，7）．The same mistake is found in 3 （nullusque ausus est resistere）．Cf．n．on （ 5,1 ）and Nah．53，iv： fury．Heb．712y，to abide may mean endure，remain firm，and ap， to stand may have the same meaning（cf．to stand fire \＆c）．Nor is it necessary to read ローアリココ（（ Wd＇s statement，Es wird nicht gesagt，dass die Heiden anfingen；schon die，welche das Unglück der Juden suchten，uurden umgebracht．Jeder． also，der im Rufe eines Judenfeindes stand，ward getödtet，is gratuitous．
 is an illogical scribal expansion derived from the end of $c .8 ; c f$ ．n．on $\mathbf{8}$ ， 14；see also passages like Deut．2，25；11，25；Josh．2，9，\＆c．The reason why．no one could withstand them was not，that all the gentiles were
frightened，but that the Jews were fully prepared for the attack and had organized a vigorous resistance and defense．
（3）For Mexby yix see n．on 3， 9.



Also the clause at the end of v．3，פח scribal expansion．It is expressed in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{VL}}$ ，but $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ omits v．4．$\$$ has
 Jews is given in v .4.

 חדוחה，2，18）．
 in the following verse（cf．n．on 8，14）．

The term（פר implies that the authorities did not interfere（cf．v．3）．If the authorities had allowed the Jews to organize armed resistance，the numerous massacres in Russia during the past few years would have been nipped
 ants of the Russian Jews were supported by the governors，military commanders，officers of the police，\＆c（see Pur．35，21；43，15．22．32． 38.

 It implies simply that the Persian Jews had free hands in dealing with their assailants owing to the non－interference on the part of the authori－ ties．Syr．$\omega$ ，means in my opinion，in my judgment．The Persian governors \＆c received no instructions to suppress all anti－Jewish demonstrations（the royal edict issued by H could not be repealed；cf． 8， $8^{\text {b }}$ ）but they did not support the assailants of the Jews，and allowed the Jews to defend themselves．In this way the permission granted by H＇s edict was not worth more than the pound of flesh which Portia＊ allowed Shylock to cut from the body of Antonio．
 the fight between the Jews and their assailants did not take place in the Acropolis，but in the City of Susa（ $c f$ ．nn．on 1，2；4，17）．In vv．12－15
 the exact meaning of $\boldsymbol{\Pi า ッ ク ゙ ; ~ t h e y ~ r e g a r d e d ~ i t ~ a s ~ a ~ k i n d ~ o f ~ e p i t h e t o n ~}$ ornans；cf．Assyr．Uruk supûru（JAOS 22，8，n．7）．No importance


[^25]in 1，2．For the occasional effacement by the scribes of characteristic diversities see Nah． 18 （ad v．4）and OLZ 10，307，below．

The addition of וֹרוֹד implies that 500 were dead or missing；cf．n．

 フモロ



（7）The names of the ten sons of H are just as doubtful as the names of the seven eunuchs $(1,10)$ or the names of the seven（？）councilors （1，14）．© follows $\mathfrak{f f t}$ ；also the names in $\mathfrak{3}$ are almost identical with those given in $\mathfrak{f f}$ ；in $\mathfrak{\Sigma}$ ，and especially in $\mathfrak{G}$ ，the divergences（which are to some extent due to popular adaptation）are greater，as is evident from the following table：

| \＆te | $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{v}}$ | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | \＄ | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 NกTッゼำ． | Фapoav каi $\mathrm{N} \epsilon \sigma \tau a \nu^{\text {a }}$ | Фapoav（кaì тòv） | Lojer | Pharsandatha |
|  | $\Delta \in \lambda \phi \omega \nu$ | ȧde入фо́v ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | ， | Delphon |
| 3 Nกฐరญ | Фаб $\mathrm{a}^{\text {b }}$ | Фарva | 209 m | Esphatha |
| 4 кถาํา | Фара $\delta a \theta a^{\text {e }}$ |  | 2－9 | Phoratha |
| 5 ถ | Bapfa ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | 1－9， | Adalia |
| 6 אถָּ | Sapßa才a |  | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | Aridatha |
| 7 א 6 | Марнабчиа | Мардабаияа | 20me | Phermestha |
| 8 א＂ | ＇Pov¢aiov |  | m． | Arisai |
| 9 ¢＇ | ＇Apraiov |  | ） | Aridai |
| 10 NกTM\％ | Za，$\beta$ ovaaîov ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | IYaOove |  | Jezatha |


 kaì ròv á $\delta € \lambda \phi \grave{\nu} \nu$ av่rô is，of course，a corruption of $\Delta \in \lambda \phi \omega \nu$ ．－（ $g$ ）Faya may be due to dittogra－ phy of $\gamma a$ in the preceding name in $\mathrm{GV}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ，Фaбya； $\mathrm{GL}^{\mathrm{L}}$ reads Фapva，but this may be a corrup－ tion of Фaбya，－（ $h$ ）\＆is，
 ffl may be miswritten for c．\＄｜Lojees is a transposition of lzopen
 written for $\bumpeq, \perp$ miswritten for 1 ；see $\mathrm{SG}^{2}, \S 2, \mathrm{C}$ ）．The form l＿ojeon is no doubt influenced by the Syr．word $120_{\text {pase }}$ ，beauty；corruptions of names are often not merely graphic but also due to popular etymology and adaptation；cf．ZDMG 61，195，9；276，8．22．28．Syr．12oíne means foolishness．

 may be due to the influence of $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i, \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s, \delta^{\prime} \lambda \phi a \xi$ ．$\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i s$ and $\Delta e \lambda \phi i \omega v$ are Greek proper names．
$\Phi a \sigma \gamma a$ may be transposed from A $\sigma \phi a \gamma$ ，and this may be a corruption
 netic spelling（see Kings 279，52）for Nก玉゙N．


 for $2 \mathbf{L}^{2}$ ．The $l$ instead of $d$ in $\Sigma^{\wedge} \underbrace{}_{i}$ ．may be due to dissimilation； see ZDMG 61，194，13；195， 4 （cf．also بلخـشا＝Badakhshân；see JHUC，No．114，p． $111^{\text {b }}$ ）．The insertion of the in $\$ \overbrace{i}$ ．may be influenced by the Greek words in Syriac which begin with tirs ；cf． Brockelmann＇s Lex．Syr．286． $\mathfrak{G}^{\varsigma}$ Фapaa $\theta a$ is miswriting for Фap $\alpha a$ a （with A for $\Delta$ ）ef．фovpal for фovp\＆l（see n．on $\mathbf{v} .26$ ）．
 be due to dittography of the final $\mathfrak{N}$ of the preceding $\mathbb{N}$（f）（for Nスプ玉）just as the prefixed Taya in $\mathfrak{G}^{2}$ Гaүaфapסa日a may be due to dittography（or rather tritography）of the second syllable of the pre－ ceding Фабүa；see above，n．$g$ ．The prefixed $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ ๆ $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ before each of the ten names may be secondary．© ${ }^{\text {sA }}$ Bape入 may be a corruption of $\mathrm{A} \rho \in \lambda=$
 $=\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ Фарада $\alpha$ ．
 the $\pi$ ．The transposition may be due to the fact that $l_{i}$ ，is more common in Syriac than $\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{r}} ;$ ．Owing to the vocalic character of the $r$ there is not much difference in Syriac between initial $\rightarrow$ and -s ；cf． $\mathrm{SG}^{2}, \S 52$（also $\S 32$ ）and for the dropping of the final $\Omega$ see $\S 26, \mathrm{C}$ ． $\Sigma_{a \rho \beta a \chi a}$ may be a corruption of $A_{\rho} \delta a \theta a$ ，the initial $\Sigma_{a}$ is perhaps due to dittography of the second syllable of the preceding Bapбa．A $\beta$ axa（for
 ＇A $\rho$ ßıár $\eta$ s，\＆c．
 and $=$ for $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ ）influenced，perhaps，by $\mid$ ismion，persuasion，supplication．



 $\psi 32,4$ and BL 45，n．1；also above，n．on 2，7）．
\＄？


 be a corruption of "פาา (see above).
$\$ 20\rceil$ seems to be shortened from Ba̧ov $\theta a \hat{i} o s$, in $\mathfrak{G}^{v}$ transposed: Za


 (EB 5245) thinks that more probable that all the names of H's sons are corruptions of Jerahmeel. Cf. footnote to n. on 2, 14 .

All these explanations are, of course, entirely conjectural (see Pur. 27,40 , which might have been cited also in ZDMG 61, 195, 14) but it is important to show that all those divergences (apparently irreconcilable) may be derived from the same text. B's statement, that some of the names in $\mathfrak{G}$ are entirely different, is an exaggeration; Wd even says that [all] the names of the sons of $H$ appear in $\mathfrak{G}$ in an entirely different form.

The Persian etymologies given by Benfey and Benary (quoted in B) are no doubt unsatisfactory (for Scheftelowitz see my remarks in AJP 27, 164; cf. J's preface) but J's Heb. etymologies are worse. J
 (Gen. 14, 2) and 'Povфaios is supposed to be T' Nפา; for 'Apraios J compares $\boldsymbol{\sim}$;
 gloriae.
(10) It is hardly necessary to add that the кai before тov̀s סéka vioùs
 Four of the ten names have dropped out in ${ }^{\text {L }}$ (just as four of the names of the seven councilors are not represented in $\mathfrak{G}$; see nn. on 1, 14). Therefore the remaining six names were no longer felt to be identical with the ten sons of H.



 libbí (HW 484 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ). It corresponds to the Assyr. ana šakân abûbi ûbla libbašun in 1.14 of the cuneiform account of the Deluge; see my remarks ad loc. in $\mathrm{KAT}^{2}$ (cf. HW 231a).* The phrase ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ² Gen. 6, 13 means it is put before my mind (for consideration) or suggests
 end of all flesh is come, i. e. the extermination of mankind is at hand according to my opinion. Ezek, 7, 6 does not prove that "פכל does not

[^26]depend on $N \mathbb{N}$ ．Nor is it possible to derive opp from $97 p$ ，to loathe （AoF 3，396：taedet me generis humani）．This idea is expressed in

（13）\＆omits בาט
For the justification of E＇s request to gibbet the ten sons of H see last n．on 8， 11 ．
（16）fft
 as soon as the Jews learned that the edict was to be in force for one more day．
 and $R$（in K）proposes to read apant $(8,13)$ or aip：；also $\mathrm{GB}^{14}, 44^{\text {b }}$ states that we must read an inf．of app；see，however，AJSL 21，141， n． 21 and the remarks on the emendation $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta_{\rho} \omega \nu$ for $\dot{\nu} \mu \omega \nu$ in nn．on 3， 7. fil ローゴがッ
 （cf．n．on 8，14）．
 $f \mathfrak{f l}$ is more original； $\mathfrak{G}$ represents a subsequent mitigation．S＇s state－ ment that $\mathfrak{G}$ as well as $\mathbb{C} \mathbb{Z} \mathfrak{J}$ have 15,000 instead of 75,000 is incorrect；$c f$ ． n．on 4，7．We need not suppose that 75,000 represents the aggregate number of the enemies of the Jews（the soldiers of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors）who were slain by the Jews in the Maccabean battles， although this may have been the opinion of the glossator who added the gloss ban in 8，11．We read in 1 M 11， 47 that 3,000 Jews，which Jona－ than（the Maccabean prototype of Mordecai；see second n．on 6，8）had sent to Antioch，at the request of King Demetrius II，about the end of в．c． 145 ，slew 100,000 men there in one day．The whole city was at the

 torical prototype of the slaughter of the assailants of the Jews in the Persian empire under the reign of Xerxes．
（17）S＇s rendering，Am dreizehnten Tage des Monats Adar da fanden sie Ruhe，und den vierzehnten machten sie zu einem Tage des Festmahls und der Freude，is impossible．K connects בירם שׂלושד צעשר לחדשׁ （at the beginning of v．17）with（an
 $\square\urcorner^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ being regarded as a parenthesis．In $\operatorname{Gav}^{v}$ this clause is transposed：


 the connection between Ex א

from the end of v .10 （cf．footnote to n ．on 2，3）．The アだ be after אדר
（18）V． 18 is omitted in $\mathbb{\$}$.
（19）Kethiv artan（as though the 9 were due to


 In pre－Maccabean times Jerusalem was the only fortress；all the other towns were פּ ב ；cf．W 96，below．According to B and S the Kethiv is incorrect． $\mathfrak{3}$ renders freely：Hi vero Judљei qui in oppidis non mu－





 omitted in $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ．

For we read that Rabbi Jjehudah sent Rabbi Osha＇yah a leg of veal and a

 partes epularum et ciborum．
（20）Wd thinks it not impossible that vv．20－28 and 29－32，which B considers to be a subsequent addition，were taken from an older source， and that $\mathbf{E}$ was composed for the purpose of explaining these two docu－ ments，just as some critics believe that the object of the Book of Jonah is to explain the psalm in c．2；contrast AJSL 23，256．B（376，below） stated：Die Einschaltung 9，20－32 wird aus einem anderen Purim－ Buche in unser Purim－Buch hineingestellt sein．But it is a mistake to suppose that the entire section 9，20－32 is derived from a different source． The first three verses（20－22）are genuine，also the first part of 26 and vv． 27 and $28^{\text {a }}$ ；but vจ．23－25，the second part of v． 26, v． $28^{\text {b }}$ ，and 29－32 represent secondary additions．They were not taken from an older source，but added by a later glossator（cf．Pur．44，31）．

M，the prime minister，had received reports from all the governors of the provinces，stating what had happened on the $13^{\text {th }}$ of Adar，how many assailants of the Jews had been slain，and how the Jews had celebrated the following day．M sent this information to all his coreligionists in the Persian empire，urging them to commemorate this notable event for all time to come．
 Ruth 4，7，where we find לקים לקים לים לים ，is a gloss．The phrase
means to enjoin upon them. \$ has pris enco. \& reads also pouls hön

 8, 9. For רer off. (Prov. 7, 20).
 the Kaph similitudinis, but the Kaph veritatis ( $\mathrm{GK}^{27}, \S 119, \mathrm{x}$ ).
(23) The section vv . $23-25$ is a gloss; see n. on v. 20. The immediate
 (i. e. on account of the במשל"ח מענות איש אל רעהח ומותפנוח לאביונים) they called these days Purim (i. e. portions, from $=$ פוחדי = בורי $=$ Vedic pûrti, portion). It was of course unnecessary in this connection to add

 etymology of $\boldsymbol{7}$, and therefore it was necessary to add the explanation.

The Persian term פורים is equivalent to Heb. מנדות, portions or presents of food (cf. Neh. 8, 10.12) exchanged at the Purim festival.
 Iranian form (*purdê) of Vedic parti (syn. dakṣina) portion, especially the portion given by the offerer to the sacrificer; cf. Ex. 29, 26; Lev. 7, 33; 8, 29. The omission of the $\mathbf{7}$ (which is preserved in $\mathfrak{G}^{\text {L }}$
 (i. e. watches, vigils) is a popular adaptation of фovpau (with A for $\Delta$ ) $=$ фovpot. This popular etymology may have been suggested by the vigils (cf. שטׁמּרים, Ex. 12, 42) or watch-meetings which have been held on New Year's eve from times immemorial. The Purim festival is a Jewish adaptation of the Persian spring festival Naurôz, and this is derived from the Babylonian New Year's festival (about the time of the vernal equinox) so that $\quad$ מנזות = פורים corresponds to Lat. strenae, French etrennes. The observance of the Persian New Year's festival was combined with the commemoration of Nicanor's Day; see Pur. 3, 6; 4,$41 ; 9,26 ; 10,39 ; 14,40 ; 17,7.23 ; 46,24.29 .32 ; * 50,37 ; 51,10 ; 52$, 4; ZDMG 61, 275, 17; 277, 1.

For קבּל read, with \& $\mathfrak{Z E}$, so, too, Oort; cf. the $Q^{e}$ rê in v. 27 and Kings 127, 46; 269, 6. The verb P is Aramaic (cf. last n. on 4, 7) $^{2}$ but it is not a denominative verb derived from B ( $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{W}$ ).

The clause refers to the celebrations of the victory over their assailants, and את אשר פתב בעידכי אליהם alludes to the two days of feasting on the $14^{\text {th }}$ and $15^{\text {th }}$ of Adar. The Jews in Susa had celebrated the $15^{\text {th }}$ day; the provincial Jews, the $14^{\text {th }}$. M recommended the perpetual general observance of both days.

[^27]（24）For 2 ，
S thinks that arבx่ after（cf．Nah．1，11）is
 $1^{0}$ is correct，and $\boldsymbol{\square} \boldsymbol{T}$ ）is an explanatory gloss to the preceding

 3，7．モ ש צ צ צ א Nニケリ．
ff with the name H might be imitated by translating to harm them or to mayhem them．For in OT are forms of ロาा；see Nah．44．On the other hand，all the forms of the stem of $\Omega$ ，execrations must be derived from 7 （ZDMG
 and AJSL 23，245，l．13；for $\because \in \operatorname{instead}$ of $\Psi$ cf．Cant． $59(a d$ v．11）and Kings 141， 26.
 B，Wd，S）but when she came，scil．E（so $\mathbb{E T}^{2}{ }^{2} \mathfrak{Z}, \mathrm{LB}, \mathrm{AV}, \mathrm{K}$ ）．The


 （so AV）．According to $\mathrm{GB}^{14}, 542^{\text {a }}$ the phrase means（he spoke）in con－ nection with a letter，i．e．by means of a letter（Arab．كتّب 0عא）．S （da verkündigte er）mit dem Schreiben which is explained to mean $z u$－ gleich mit dem Erlass des Schreibens（contrast ニกコロコニ ロּוֹ，Ezr．1，1；
 （B，Wd，K）．ffinain is a tertiary gloss referring to the letter which the King had authorized H to send to all the governors \＆c（3，12；8，5）． The first glossator simply stated：The King said，The mischief which H planned against the Jews，shall recoil on his own head；so H and his ten sons were impaled．A subsequent glossator deemed it necessary to empha－ size the fact that the King had made this statement although he had authorized $\mathbf{H}$ to exterminate all the Jews in his empire；he therefore
 authorized H to send to the governors \＆c）．For ay ，in spite of cf．

[^28]TTーy (Neh. 5, 18) and WdG 2, 164, below. The statement of the
 F glossator might have said: ישוב בוּ

(26) For the first part of v. 26 see n. on v. 23. The author of the
 Pers. word for $L_{0} 9$ sen ; here $L_{5} 9$ may be a corruption (or adaptation) of $1_{5}$. Instead of קרו ליף
 i.e. punishment, trial (cf. AJSL 23, 227, l. 11; ZDMG 61, 286, 30) from $77^{7}$, to boil (see Nah. 43). The rendering Unheil (given in Dalman's Wörterbuch) is unwarranted. $\mathbb{1}^{2}$ may have combined פורח winepress $=$ Blutbad (massacre, carnage). See Pur. 51, 38 and third paragraph of nn . on 3,7 .

The second part of $v .26$ is a gloss explaining the $\eta$ at the beginning of the verse, with special reference to 112 P at the beginning of v. 27. The $\eta$. $y$ to be explained is repeated at the beginning of the explanation; see Ezekiel 41, 16.22.27 and the translation of Ezek. (SBOT) p. 1, below; p. 94, below; cf. also gloss $\tau$ in my restoration of $\psi$ 68 (AJSL 23, 239 and 224)). Two explanations of $7 \mathcal{y}$ are given; the
 ם.t. The second is a tertiary gloss explaining the preceding

 therefore this tertiary gloss substitutes simply might be misunderstood, and was therefore explained by $y^{2}$ na
 had seen, but what they had experienced; cf. the explanation of
 allen den Worten des Briefs, so wohl in Betreff dessen, was sie selbst dieserhalb erlebten, als dessen was sie betraf, setzten die Juden fest, is monstrous ( $c f$. n. on 4, 7). Also AV and K connect the verb at the beginning of v .27 with the preceding clause.
(27) For 712 p pread 71297 . This is the sequel of the clause at the
 verb 72 peing coordinated to

The following לקבּק ( Q $^{e} \mathrm{rê}$ ) is a gloss to the preceding it was added owing to the "לֹּק at the beginning of the gloss vv. 23-25.
 n．ou 2,3 ．

For aーヴy we must not read aーアウ（contrast last n．on 4，5）．In ם וֹה this preposition means in addition to；see Kings 125， 7.



 For transposition of 9 see also Nah． 41 （コールグ for ニージ，\＆c）．
 their time（but $\ddagger$ erıーロ uritten traditions concerning these days（festal regulations，festal legends，\＆c；see Pur．11，35；9，22）and according to their dates，viz． the $14^{\text {th }}$ and $15^{\text {th }}$ of Adar；i．e．the last full moon of the $\boldsymbol{B}$ ，the tropical year（AJSL 22，256）．For the reason why the two spring festirals， Purim and Passover，are not celebrated at the vernal equinox，on the first day of the first month，but on the $14^{\text {th }}$ and $15^{\text {th }}$ days of the $12^{\text {th }}$ and the $1^{\text {st }}$ months，respectively，see conclusion of n．on v．31．For the

 n．on $\prod^{7} \mathrm{C}$（8，9）．
（28）The second part of this verse is an explanatory gloss，not only to the first part of v .28 ，but also to the end of v .27 ．इ has pins for リージ，and；n for 570＂．
（29）Verses 29－32 represent a subsequent addition．

 The original text of this gloss was no doubt：ת
 the pouer of the Jew M in order to enjoin this Purim message（which M had sent to the Jews；see vv．20－22）i．e．E sent a letter to all the Jews setting forth M＇s capacity for action and performance（especially öra $\dot{e} \pi \pi o i n \sigma e v$, what he had accomplished for his coreligionists and what he might accomplish for them in the future）and urging them to observe
 only of E ，not of M ． $\mathfrak{G}^{\boldsymbol{V}}$ reads in the present verse：каi ${ }^{\text {érpaquev }} \mathbf{E} \sigma \theta \eta \rho$
 original reading may have been каi $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { é } \\ \hline\end{array}\right)$

fixin b AV with all authority；K unter Einsetzung ihres ganzen Ansehens；

3 omni studio．This expression would be still more peculiar than the

 I love thee with all my strength（cf．Mark 12，30）would be לコニ リーin

 for 5 ת
ff sequent addition．
（30）V． 30 is omitted in $\mathfrak{G}$ ．
 text may have been Tלשתा；the masculine form may have been sub－
 on the other hand，the feminine form has been substituted for the mas－ culine form（אבחה הת have reminded some readers of Job 40，17：Tan בit＝cauda Hor．Sat．1，2，45；2，7，49．The original meaning of $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\square}$ ＝ （Cant．5，2）BL 33.
 \＄rLaの bas．
 mean words of peace and truth（so AV；S Worte des Friedens und der Wahrheit； $\mathfrak{3}$ ut haberent pacem et susciperent veritatem； $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ •לי＂ Nยשาקד 80，27）．LB mit freundlichen und treuen Worten， K mit freund－ schaftlichen und wohlgemeinten Worten．The Queen，of course，did not send a warlike message or a statement that was not true；but she sent her coreligionists friendly greetings，emphasizing the fact that she would remain a faithful Jewess and never abandon the religion of her fathers．
（31）ff in is a tertiary gloss．
 supposes，but to the Jews；cf．．לקים in v． 21.
ff anקצit procedures（cf．n．on 1，13）or institutions of the great fast（plur．intens．） and their crying（or invocation），มT ； Nת＂Jรnti．This refers to $4,1.3 .16$ ． $\mathbf{M}$ had cried with a loud and bitter cry（חา
 Afterwards $\mathbf{E}$ asked $\mathbf{M}$ to fast with all the Jews of Susa for her sake， three days and three nights，before she went to the King，and E herself with her maids fasted in the same way．

 the Jews had adopted the fasting (and crying) before they adopted the feasting. They may have observed the Babyl. New Year's festival at first as a fast-day, but the less orthodox Jews (the Sadduceans) may have gradually adopted the celebration of the (Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (just as many modern Jews celebrate Christmas). This was afterwards sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but the date was changed: the feast was celebrated, not at the beginning of the first month, but at the middle of the preceding month, just as the ancient Heb. spring festival, the Passover, was not celebrated at the beginning (new moon) of the first month (about the time of the vernal equinox) but at the middle (full moon) of the first month, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish Passover and the Babylonian New Year's festival.

During the Babyl. Captivity Ezekiel (about 570 в. с.) recommended to observe the Day of Atonement on the $1^{\text {st }}$ of Tishri, while the New Year was to be celebrated on the $10^{\text {th }}$ of Tishri, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish New Year with the Babyl. festival at the beginning of the second half of the year. Under Persian dominion, about 500 в. с. (when the Priestly Code was compiled in Babylonia) the two festivals in the seventh month, as prescribed by Ezekiel, exchanged places so that the Day of Atonement was observed on the $10^{\text {th }}$ of Tishri, because the Persians celebrated the $\mu$ ayoфóva on that day. Cf. n. on v. 27 and Pur. 4, 20-37; 20, 3; 33, 14.
(32) Wd's view that $\mathfrak{ฺ อ ะ ~ r e f e r s ~ e i t h e r ~ t o ~ t h e ~ b o o k ~ f r o m ~ w h i c h ~ t h e ~}$ author took the two letters (cf. n. on v. 20) or to our Book of E, is gratuitous. Heb. 7ョoב does not necessarily mean in the book (AV) it may also mean in a book (so K, S) see Kings 191, 37.
(1) For the misplaced gloss in v .1 see fourth paragraph of nn . on 2,18.
(2) In $v .2^{a}$ we must transpose ${ }^{a}$ and $\beta$ : the opening clause, bəา

 refers to M, not to the King.

The clause 5, 11; it cannot mean whereunto the King advanced him (so AV; K zu der ihn der Kōnig erhob) nor does it mean whom the King advanced
 or whereby the King had advanced him (B; 3 qua exaltavit Mardochœum). Cf. footnote to n . on 2,3 .
 \＄人 （
 acceptable to most of his brethren（contrast n．on 4，3）but acceptable to the multitude of his brethren，i．e．to his numerous coreligionists（so $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{S})$ ．In the large number of his coreligionists there was not one who disliked him．Cf．

 haughty and distant，but affable and kind to the meanest among his brethren，in spite of his exalted position．For ロッּ
 －路
［The Hebrew text follows．］

9,22

 27.26

 28


10,2

 לצמםו ורבּ שלום לבל זרצוּ

" 9,6


| ואת ארידתא: <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |
| ואת אריד |
|  |

 7
ואת דלפּוֹך
ו
า ואת
8
ואת אדּלִיא
, צשירת בֵי הּ
אח

 ואח בטּ
 13
 הערוּ 14

 16 16
 אדּ 18




21


| (x) 11 הבירח | $7{ }^{7 \times 1}$ | (e) 6 (e) 6 הירד | (n) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| לֹא שלחר את ידם | (v) 16 (vaty | ( | 12(x) 12 רצירד |
|  | הפרזות | (o) 19 (o) | (\%) 16 (1) 10 |
















9, 2

 4



 וחת
 8


 - 9


 8, x
 2 אכחר אה טרדבי על בית הםֶ; 3 4



 7 ם 8

 9







6
 8.7 לבוש מולבות אשו לבשי בו המולך וסום אשר רכב עליו הבּלך \}






 אשר דמבלך דופץ ביק ביקו:
12





א,
 3




בנזק הבגלך:


 2

 3 4

 הגמשתה אשׁר עשתה אשתר:
 7 8

 9
 , ויתאבֵק




 14



6, 2 בותה א ות

| Tan 12 (8) | \%an 11 (\%) | \%n 5,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (a) |
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 לבורא אל הבהלך דוח שלושים יום: 13.1214


 לג:לבות:





 2
 לא יכרע ולא ישתחִרוה: ויאמורו עבדי המיךך אשר בשצר חהמלך3




 ויאברו הבן לגםלך 8
 9




בעינךד:
12 ויםקראי טפּרי המלךך בחדש הראשון בשלושושה עשר יום בו






 עתִדים לֹיזם הזה:



על שלרשה עשׂר- לדדש שׂים עשר (הרא חדש אדר):

2

 בית דגשים לדעת את שלום אשת־ ועה היקשה בה:








 16





21 22 23


(o) 22 לאשתר המלכה ותאמר אסתר למילך בשם מרדכי
 ואת מאממר מרדבי אטתר עשׁה כאשר היתח באָמימה אתרו:


 בציניזן באברם המבלך






21
 ואל עם ועם כלשונו להיות כל איש שוֹרֵ בביתף :

2, 2
 מדיינות מלכותו ויקבצו את כל פערה בתולח טובת מעראה אל בל
 ושתי וייםב הדבר בעיכי המילך ויעש קן:
 6 6







```
1,16 (\nu)
*)
#
```



## בגבלת אשתר

1, 未 2 3 4


 6

 8
 2:
ביום השבּ חִּ 11 12

 14
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[^0]:    * It might be well to add that the references to $C$ were inserted after I had completed the revision of my manuscript, in July, 1907. Some etymologies proposed by C are impossible, but several of his remarks are superior to the observations found in the leading commentaries.

[^1]:    *Cf, the remarks of Cornill and Ed. Meyer cited in AJSL 23, 221; also Budde, Geschichte der althebr. Litteratur (Leipzig, 1906) p. 33.

[^2]:    *Cf. also b7ヨy=Assyr. abubu (Nah. 31) and modern Arab. qaba-jûr for French abat-jour (VG 1, 121, below).
    
    $\ddagger$ IN 23 Ed. Meyer still renders: Ross und Reiter; he also maintains the pre-Exilic date of Moses' Song of Triumph. He agrees with me, however, in stating (p. 49, below) that there is some historical nucleus in the story of the catastrophe of the Egyptians; cf. my remarks in AJSL 20, 149. 153. 154. 158.

[^3]:    *This must not be interpreted to mean that all proper names, or titles, that might be dispensed with should be canceled, even if they are omitted in some of the Ancient Versions. $\dagger$ This is correct only if we include $\boldsymbol{\square} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ in 1,$19 ; 4,14 ; 5$, 1 , where it refers to $\mathbf{E}$.

[^4]:    ＊Assyr．sapatu（HW 684a）＝שut or axta for axta（HW 273a，1．2）do not prove
     ตกา， partial assimilation；see AJSL 23，248，below．
    $\dagger$ See also Moses Schort，Altbabyl．Rechtsurkunden（Vienna，1907）p．171，below．

[^5]:    ＊Cf．the scribal expansions（derived from 3，13）at the end of 8,11 and 8,3 （derived from 9,25 ）also the glosses at the end of 9,2 and 3 （derived from the end of c．8）and the
     and $50 ก$ ตา（6，2）and second $n$ ．on 6， 8 ．

[^6]:     On the preceding page Ch states that we must substitute for Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk (Ex. 23, 19) Thou shalt not clothe thyself with the garment of a Jerahmee. lite woman. Cf. Acts 26, 24.

[^7]:     den（Vienna，1907）p．117．

[^8]:    *Even in $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{10,34;13,34} \mathrm{ä} \mathrm{\phi} \mathrm{\varepsilon} \mathrm{\sigma} \mathrm{\iota s} \mathrm{does} \mathrm{not} \mathrm{mean} \mathrm{remission} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{taxes} \mathrm{(á} \mathrm{\tau é} \mathrm{\lambda e} \mathrm{\iota a)}. \mathrm{Cf}. \mathrm{18}, \mathrm{39:}$
     used of the release of prisoners; cf. however vv. 29-31.
     andanu, to give $=\mathfrak{i n}$, SFG 43, 2) are euphemisms; of. AJSL 23, 231, n. 27; Pur.47, 31.

[^9]:    *Cf. the cut on p 178 of the translation of Ezekiel in SBOT.

[^10]:    ＊Cf．also the confusion of names discussed in AJSL 23，227，1． 6 and the confusion be－ tween H and M（see Pur．3，26）in S，referred to in n．on 7，8．See also Daniel 29,15 ；ZDMG 61，294，1．12；and Weissbach＇s article Euphrates in Pauly－Wissowa＇s encyclope－ dia，$\S 4$（according to Hesychius the Jews called the Euphrates E $\delta \delta e \kappa \varepsilon \lambda$ ）．
    $\dagger$ Cf．also L，Purim，p．9，below（ $\qquad$

[^11]:    ＊The founder of the dynasty of Reuss，Henry I，was called Ruzze，Reusse，or Ruthene owing to his exploits against the Poles or Western Russians about 1247；cf．Resch，Úber den Ursprung des dynastischen Namens Reuss（Gera，1874）．The Gymnasium illustre at Gera is known as Rutheneum．Cf，the title of the Czar：Selbstherrscher aller Reussen， French autocrate de toutes les Russies（i．e．Great Russia，Little Russia，White Russia，\＆c）．
    †Similarly the Greeks used Hyperboreans as a general name for the inhabitants of northern countries，and the Hungarians are often called Huns；contrast THCO 162.

[^12]:    ＊Cf．the last but one paragraph of nn．on 2． 18 and the misplaced glosses in 2，19．20，
    
    $\dagger$ See the Varionum Apocrypha，London（Eyre \＆Spottiswoode）．
    $\ddagger$ The original form of this word is not פּ פ portion；see n．on 9， 26.

[^13]:    ＊Contrast Budde＇s Geschichte der althebr．Litteratur（Leipzig，1906）p．26，1．8．
    $\dagger$ According to Gla aser（OLZ 9．320）Heb．7I（see Kings 163，n．＊）may mean part，por－ tion，lot，oracle（cf．Pur．45，3）．As to－TSN，Glaser thinks，it is not a loin－cluth $=$
     fig．s）but a band or scarf like the stole worn by Roman Catholic priests，or the pall of the
    

[^14]:    ＊For the reason why the Day of Atonement was observed during the Babylonian Cap－ tivity on the 1st of Tishri，while the New Year was to be celebrated on the 10 th of Tishri，see conclusion of $n$ ，on 9,31 ．
    $\dagger$ In the new tezts found during the German excavations at Kal＇at Shergat（Assur） Assyr，akitu appears as a synonym of kiretu $=\boldsymbol{M} 7(2 \mathrm{~K} 6,23)$ and $\left(\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{g}}\right.$ qiran（see Kings 208，15；MDOG，No．33，p．34；cf．the photograph of the bit akiti，ibid．p．30）．This shows that the etymology of akitu，given in Pur．31，3，is correct．dkitu appears in the
    
    

[^15]:     than

[^16]:    

[^17]:    ＊In the German Reichstag Gen．Von Deimling，the commander of the colonial troops in German Southwestern Africa，said on May 26，1906：Darüber haben Sie hier nicht zu bestimmen，sondern ein Anderer（i．©．the Emperor）．In his novel Tristram of Blent （vol．1，p． $25 \%$ of the Tauchnitz edition）Anthony Hope says：And if by a miracle he ［the prime minister］said yes，for all I know somebody else might say no．This dark refer－ ence to the Highest Quarters caused Southend to nod thoughtfully．－Ibid．p． 270 we find： There was now not only the very grave question whether Robert Disney［the prime minister］ －to say nothing of Somebody Else－would entertain the idea；and on p． 117 of vol．2：The last words had，presumably，reference to the same quarter that Lady Evenswood had once described by the words＂Somebody Else．＂

[^18]:    *In BDB 6636 า and back $=$ future; $\mathbf{c f}{ }^{\top} .{ }^{\top}{ }^{\top}$ FG 15, n. 3.

[^19]:    ＊I believe，of course，that E is entirely fictitious（see Pur．21，35）．I merely try to defend the author of $\mathbf{E}$ against unwarranted criticisms of modern expositors（cf．e．g．no．on 2,$10 ; 3,14 ; 7,7 ; 8,11.13 ; 9,3$ ）just as my paper on Jonah＇s Whale（cf．AJSL 23，255）in the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society，vol，46，pp．151－164（1907）is not a vindication of the historical cbaracter of this Sadducean apo＇ogue（about 100 b．C．）but a refutation of some unfounded objections raised by modern students of the Bible．

[^20]:    ＊M A in such cases must be connected with the preceding word，not with the following
     dangerous snoke and similar cases（WdG 2，276，D）ms emphasizes the preceding word； the original meaning is：A snake－dangerous indeed she（or he）．For the emphatic－ma in Assyrian see also Moses Schorr，Altbabyl．Rechtsurkunden（Vienna，1907）p． 60.

[^21]:    ＊H＇s pole is a May－pole ；see Pur．11， 23 ；BL 102.

[^22]:    ＊For the transposed doublet ■า in Syriac see footnote to n．on v． 7.
    $\dagger$ Just as we find both 7 and and in Assyrian，so we have also both piru and pilu，elephant；of．qirbu and qablu＝qalbu（see last n．on 4，4）．

[^23]:    
     not valid．It is true that we use horse for horsemen．

[^24]:    ＊In Moses Schulbaum＇s Deutsch－Hebr．Wörterbuch（Lemberg，1881）\％ע \％ In iviven as the Heb．cquivalent of Nothwehr．

[^25]:    ＊Cf．the interesting appendix to part iii（Vienna，1907）of D．H．M aller，Die Mehri－ und Soqotri－Sprache，pp．159－165，entitled Die Wanderung der Portia－Sage；cf．ibid．pp．23－ 33：Die Portia von Gischin，and pp．73－87：Die Portia von Zafar；see also ZDMG 61，495．

[^26]:    *For Jensen's translation die Sturmfluth zu machen "brachte hervor" ihr Herz die grossen Gotter (KB 6, 231) see my remarks in JAOS 22,9.

[^27]:    *In l. 22 read Franz for Harder.

[^28]:     （not in the oven）is an Aram．loanword with $\dot{\varepsilon}$（owing to the preceding）for $\mathcal{\varepsilon}=\dot{v}$ ；cf．
    
     chaff．

